THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A CHARACTERISTIC section in Principal H. Wheeler ROBINSON'S recent volume, *Redemption and Revelation*, is devoted to the consideration of the Redeemer as the 'God-man.' In the theology of the ancient Church, dominated as it was by Greek thought, the problem of the Person of Jesus Christ was chiefly that of reconciling two different 'natures,' the human and the divine, both assumed to be somehow present in the one Person. But in the modern world, as our author contends, we conceive of ultimate reality in terms not of abstract 'nature' but of concrete personal activity and personal relation. Accordingly, the modern approach to the problem of the Person must be made through the conception of human personality.

If we approach the problem along the lines of our human personality, we shall ascribe to the manhood of Jesus Christ a genuine individuality of outlook, the unity of a single will, and a sense of social solidarity with all men. And all this is amply corroborated by the Synoptic Gospels. But if we feel the need to go further and claim for Him a unique manhood that makes Him God manifest in the flesh, then we shall not solve the problem, as they sought to do in the time before Chalcedon, by trying to add the divine to the human, or by dovetailing the divine into the human, or by sacrificing the human to the divine. A deeper view of personality is needed.

We must not conceive of a permanent gulf as separating the human and the divine, such as would make impossible the indwelling of the human by the divine. The tendencies of the Greek dualism must not be allowed to obscure the Biblical view of man as akin to God. Because of this kinship human personality is, as we should allow, potentially capable of being brought into perfect harmony with the divine. Indeed, on the purely historical plane, no distinction could be drawn in the result, between human personality achieving its potentialities in a given environment, and divine personality manifesting itself in the same environment. There is a difference, of course, and one of highest importance, but it is a difference not of historical actuality but of interpretation.

None the less, the more we recognize the uniqueness of Jesus Christ, the more are we driven to seek some unique explanation of it, such as the Virgin Birth, or the incarnation of the Logos, or the divine control of history and environment.

Further, our approach to the Person of the Redeemer through human personality will always need for its complement the study of His redemptive work, what He has wrought for us and in us. And Christian experience has always found it necessary to affirm that no mere man, however exalted his manhood, but only God has wrought this great redemption. If the coming of Jesus Christ in the fullness of the time is an ascent of man, His redemptive activity is a descent of God.

In our Christologies the attempt should be made to do justice both to the ascent and to the descent. 'There is a tunnel constructed in the eighth century B.C. which links the Virgin's Spring outside Jerusalem with the Pool of Siloam. An inscription tells of its excavation simultaneously from above and from below, and there was natural anxiety as to whether the two excavations would meet. That anxiety was relieved when a rift in the rock enabled each party of miners to hear the others, though three cubits remained to be hewn through. So also the Christian theologian must ask himself whether his lines of ascent and descent will happily meet, whether his theory succeeds in bringing together the divinity and the humanity of the God-man, so that the waters of life may flow through without interruption.'

Perhaps we should describe the relation of Jesus Christ to the Father as His dwelling in God rather than as God's dwelling in Him—a conscious life in God, through which was actualized the veritable presence of God on earth. A suggestive if remote parallel may be found in the partial and intermittent surrender of the saint to God, through which God by His Holy Spirit continues His dwelling upon the earth. Here the unity of the divine and the human is seen in the identification of the divine and human wills, but we cannot reduce to a formula such a miracle of grace, even

in the saint. Far less can we do so in the case of the God-man. We need not, however, doubt that in approaching Christ we approach God Himself, so far as man may yet know Him.

As for the relation of the God-man to the Godhead, here also our experience offers no example of such an inclusion of full personality within a higher form of Being. Divine personality must be free of the limitations besetting personality within the time-order; its continued 'becoming,' its constant suggestion of something higher than itself, its exclusive individuality of consciousness. If we may not speak of divine personality, we forfeit in relation to God our highest and most spiritual category.

'The greater must include the less—that seems to be one of the great laws of the spiritual life, whether we think of the inclusive mystery of our own human consciousness, or that higher mystery by which the human characteristics of Jesus are taken up into the real personality of the God-man, or finally that ultimate mystery of His inclusion in the Being and activity of the Godhead.'

Between God and Man (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), by Mr. John Hadham, is another challenging book by the author of 'Good God' and 'God in a World at War.' It is the author's contention that the Christian bridge between God and Man which St. Paul built on the foundation of the Christian faith in the Incarnation has largely broken down, and that no amount of buttressing will restore it again. We must plan a new bridge, but on the self-same foundations.

Mr. Hadham professes allegiance to the Church of England and holds by the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation. It is, as he says, not so much that God *gave*, or that God *sent*, as that God *came*. This truth the Christian religion cannot let go, paradoxical and mysterious as it is.

'He came in the person of a son of a simple artisan man and wife, and in this sense he looked to himself as his heavenly Father. And in coming he divested himself of his divine knowledge and authority to assume that humanity which he had created in his own image. A paradox? Why not? A mystery? Of course. By what logic can we deny that paradox and mystery exist in the world? By what right can we assume that nothing can happen beyond what we are capable of reducing to a logical explanation on the basis of precedents?'

He adds, 'Those who believe in him may believe also that the method of his birth was unique, and that it was attended by spiritual manifestations. In the same way they may believe that after his death he showed himself to his disciples as proof of his victory. But these matters are not susceptible to ordinary proof, and are not meant to be. For it was essential for God that he should not, by his coming, destroy human free will and men's responsibility for their belief.'

Now Mr. Hadham as a Christian believer does well to take his stand on the doctrine of the Incarnation, as the foundations of the bridge which Christian theology has built between God and man. But can he validly make the sharp distinction he seeks to make between faith and the theological expression of faith, experience and the theological statement of experience? His own words above quoted, which are apparently meant to be taken as a simple affirmation of faith, contain no small amount of theological explanation. The theologian might readily point out that the sentence, 'he divested himself of his divine knowledge and authority to assume that humanity which he had created in his own image,' is reminiscent of ideas that have played a great part in the history of Christian theology: *kenosis, anhypostasia, imago dei.*

The new bridge which Mr. Hadham would see built between God and man does not appear to be so new as he thinks it is. In any case, while it is abuilding (and he admits it will take some generations to build it), there are thousands of simple folk—to use his own language—who can hardly be denied the use of the old bridge. It would be the grossest intellectual arrogance to refuse their right to the old paths, or to ignore the fact that the official guardians of the old paths still possess a considerable skill and experience in guiding them upon their way.

Indeed, we gravely question whether in this interval of bridge-building there will be found many who would come together for work and worship, 'united only by sincerity and by the belief that there is a creative power behind the world, and a purpose in life.' After all, as Mr. Hadham admits, a creed or confession of faith is no more than an explanation or interpretation; and would it not be well that, while a new interpretation is being worked out in the light of modern knowledge, the faithful should stay by each other under cover of the old historical interpretation?

The book ends on a welcome note of confidence. With reference to the restatement of the faith for which our age calls, it is said: 'Let each man make his contribution as he may. We are living again in days similar to those of the first exponents of our religion. We shall contradict each other, without doubt; but once we start, another Paul, another John will arise to do for this century what the first Paul and John did for theirs; and, like them, will release into a weary and disillusioned world power beyond the wildest dreams of men.'

Under the title of *New Testament Studies* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, Nashville; $2.50), there has recently appeared a very fresh and interesting volume of 'critical essays in New Testament interpretation, with special reference to the meaning and worth of Jesus.'

The editor is Professor Edwin Prince Booth of Boston University, and he is to be congratulated on having assembled a distinguished group of contributors each of whom has given of his best. Among the topics treated are such as Dogma and Drama in the Gospel of Mark, the '*ipsissima verba*' or the '*ipsissimus Spiritus*,' the Jesus of '*Formgeschichte*,' the New Testament on War and Peace. One of the most illuminating is the opening essay by Professor Elmer A. Leslie on 'Semitic Backgrounds and New Testament Study.' In this essay the writer deals at some length with the 'Covenant' idea which he very justly regards as 'the deepest element in the religion of the Bible.' On this subject some remarks may not unprofitably be made.

There is embodied in the very names, Old Testament and New Testament, not only an acknowledgment of an organic unity between the two, but also an acknowledgment that the Covenant idea is fundamental in both. For the term *testamentum* is the Latin equivalent of the Greek *diatheké* and of the Hebrew *berith*, all of which mean 'covenant.' The Covenant referred to is, of course, the Covenant which God made with Israel in terms of which He would be their God and Saviour while they would be His loyal people.

This Covenant took its rise from a free, gracious act of God, and upon it was based the claim which Israel made to be in a special sense His people. Unlike the nations round them who claimed their god as the progenitor of their race and therefore bound to them by natural ties as their ally and helper, the people of Israel firmly said, 'No, we have no such natural claim upon our God. Our forefathers were heathen worshipping false gods, until Jehovah graciously revealed Himself to us and chose us for His own.' This Covenant was first made with Abraham when in obedience to the divine call he went forth seeking a better country. It was solemnly renewed at Sinai after Israel had been delivered from Egypt under the leadership of Moses. In that great deliverance the essential nature of the Covenant was revealed as a Covenant between God the Redeemer and the helpless folk whom He had redeemed.

This thought of redemption and of undeserved privilege runs through the Old Testament and is central in the teaching of the greatest prophets. No doubt the people of Israel became proud of their special relation to God and based false hopes upon it, but the prophets laboured to show their unworthiness of it, and any idea, such as some might cherish, of being true born children of God by natural descent, was to the prophets utterly abhorrent. Ezekiel puts it quaintly when he pictures Israel as a poor foundling cast away in the desert to die when Jehovah took pity upon it, cleansed it and took it for His own. To the prophets it was a continual sorrow that Israel so determinedly transgressed the Covenant and, but for the infinite grace and patience of God, would have made it null and void. At last there sprang up in the great soul of Jeremiah the hope of a new and better Covenant, based upon the forgiveness of sins and having its law written on men's hearts. On no other terms could he conceive that the Covenant between God and His people would be able to endure.

It is this new Covenant which is revealed and ratified in the New Testament, as its very name implies. That it is an element not only present but dominant in Christian thought we are assured on the highest authority. Jesus stood in the full stream of Covenant ideas and His very being is an incarnation of them. 'In the tragic, climactic hour of His ministry, in the fellowship of the Last Supper with His disciples, Jesus fastened upon Jeremiah's concept of the covenant, and linked it to Himself with unique concreteness as "the new covenant in my blood." By it He bound Himself to the Christian community, the new Israel, and the Christian community to Himself. And still to-day wherever Christians celebrate the sacrament of the Lord's Supper they affirm in symbolic and verbal commitment their acceptance of and loyalty to this covenant bond that unites them to God, made unchallengingly clear and inescapable by the teaching, the life, and the death of our Lord.'

That being so, it may seem strange that the Covenant idea has so little place in the Christian

thinking of our time. It was not always so. On the contrary, it dominated the theology of the Reformation, so that one of the principal types of Christian doctrine is known in history as 'Covenant Theology.' It was specially influential in the Reformed Churches of Holland and Scotland and among the Puritans of England. Scotland in particular has long been known as the land of the Covenants. Under the influence of the Covenant idea the Scottish people made national covenants, binding themselves as a nation to God, and many also made their own private covenants which they renewed from year to year. They believed, as one of their martyrs cried aloud from the scaffold, that the Covenants would yet be Scotland's reviving.

Why, then, has the Covenant Theology now fallen into disrepute? The reason may be twofold. On the one hand these national covenants went beyond the purely religious simplicity of the Gospel Covenant by introducing dubious elements of a political kind. On the other hand the Covenant theology itself came to be stated in terms which were rather legalistic and coldly logical, and so it ceased to express and convey the warm heart of the gospel. We find, for example, Principal Hywel Hughes in his recent work on 'Psychology and Religious Truth' expressing gratification that psychology is compelling men to view religious problems from the standpoint of personality and personal relations, and is 'forcing theological scholars to abandon the federal conceptions which have dominated theology . . . for conceptions more personal and more in harmony with the basic truth of God's love.' This may be just criticism of the Covenant Theology as commonly expressed and understood, but it involves a complete misconception of the Biblical Covenant. The terms 'federal' and 'personal' should never be set in contrast, for nothing could be more utterly personal than the Covenant wherein God in His infinite grace pledges Himself to be the Saviour of sinful man, and sinful man on his part gratefully accepts the offered mercy and pledges himself to be the Lord's.

A revival of the basic idea of the Covenant Theology in the Scriptural sense would be a wholesome ingredient in the religious thought of to-day, for when we begin to speak, as so many do, of all men indiscriminately as the children of God and therefore as having some natural claim on God's favour, we are in reality relapsing to the religious attitude of the pagan contemporaries of ancient Israel who claimed the protection and favour of their gods as a natural right. All such ideas are utterly foreign to the New Testament, and rightly so because they obscure the grace of God and make His Redemption of small account. New Testament teaching is that only they that have the Spirit of God are the sons of God, only to them that receive Him to them has He given the right to be sons of God. The vital truth which the Covenant idea safeguards is the truth that salvation comes not by any natural right but by the free gift of divine grace. So thereby the grace of the Redeemer is magnified and His redeemed people are constrained from the heart to sing *Soli Deo Gloria*.

Reconstruction Problems.

X. Worship.

By J. Middleton Murry, London.

Worship, I am told by the only dictionary I have by me, is 'homage or service paid to God, adoration felt or shown for a person or a principle.' I do not challenge the explanations; but I confess they leave me unsatisfied. And the reason for my dissatisfaction is that they do not tally with that experience or attitude in myself which I have been accustomed to distinguish as worship. Possibly it is I who am at fault, and I have used the word worship arbitrarily. I do not believe that. Neither, on the other hand, do I believe that the dictionary definitions are at fault. The truth is that we are concerned with something essentially indefinable: the very heart and quick of religion.

Awe—worship—adoration. Does worship come where I have placed it—a middle term between awe and adoration in a kind of crescendo? Or is it rather that awe and adoration are two moments, aspects, or emphases in worship? It would seem natural and congruous with my experience to say that worship of God the Father was primarily awe, and worship of God the Son was primarily adora-

tion; while worship of both together, in a single attitude, was worship indeed, not as being truer than either separately, but as nearer to worship in its fullness.

Or we may use another pair of counterparts: fear and love, in the place of awe and adoration. They seem simpler and more human. Worship, as an attitude, is compounded of both. But compounded is a gross word. Worship is rather the posture of the human soul at the point where love begins 'to cast out fear.' Not that we cease to be afraid of the Power which we feared, but the quality of our fear changes. Perhaps we may say it passes into awe, while the love which inspires the change becomes adoration.

But this may be hardly more than a kind of juggling with words. The more substantial point is that in the attitude of worship are combined elements which may, at one level, be distinguished as awe and adoration, and at another as fear and love. At the more strictly human level, fear and love have more of the pure antithesis in them. The great Christian paradox that 'perfect love casteth out fear' would lose its point were it translated into 'perfect adoration casteth out awe.' At the level of awe and adoration, fear and love have been brought as it were into harmony: and that harmony is worship.

But at the more strictly human level, fear and love, though more clearly antithetical, are not mutually exclusive. I remember vividly the moment when as a little boy newly entered on a 'religious, royal and ancient' educational foundation, with others of my kind, I stood for the first time in the presence of the Headmaster, in Geneva black and bands. If he had spoken to me—mercifully he did not—my tongue would certainly have refused its office. It would not be untrue to say I was awe-struck; but it would be truer to say I was simply terrified. Fear was the dominant. Nevertheless, as time went on, my attitude subtly changed; and though he retired before I was twelve years old, and though he never spoke a word to me personally, so that the gulf between us was never diminished by any familiarity, by that time I had come to regard him with a curious kind of distant affection, as being himself the embodiment of authority and justice, and as being also the guardian of the high and venerable traditions of the school. And I resented, with a passionate and quite unjust resentment, the arrival and the innovations of a new Headmaster.

It would hardly be an abuse of language to say that I worshipped the former Headmaster; and it would not be easy to distinguish the mingling of fear and love I felt towards him, from the mingled awe and adoration of an adult religion. And such a position might be placed as a gradation between the still more natural and primitive mingling of fear and love towards my own father and the perfected harmony of fear and love in awe and adoration which, I have suggested, is the attitude of religious worship. No doubt, in the days when the divine right of kings was unquestioned, something akin to my schoolboy reverence for my Headmaster was universally felt towards 'our Sovereign Lord the King'; and to-day, throughout the Roman Catholic Church, a kindred attitude is held towards the Pope. I feel something of it myself. Schismatic though I am, it is to His Holiness the Pope rather than His Majesty the King or His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury that I look as the Headmaster of my religion.

But, in describing this attitude, quite naturally the word 'reverence' came to my pen. When I said that it would hardly be an abuse of language to say that I worshipped my old Headmaster, I was conscious that it was an abuse of language after all. Or at least it was a poetic exaggeration, of which I was instantly aware. It would be a more restrained form of the licence by which the lover speaks of worshipping his mistress. Such a phrase may be felt as either an insensitive extravagance of language, or as something rather different. It depends on our knowledge of the man who uses it, or of whom it is used. When, for example, speaking of the grief of a bereaved husband for his dead wife, sympathetic folk say 'He simply worshipped her,' we may be either repelled or attracted, according as we sense whether the attitude was worthy or unworthy. It may imply an imbecility of uxoriousness, which is distasteful and reprehensible; but it may also imply that the husband saw in his wife the child of God. He did not worship her, but something manifest in and through her—God's beneficent and creative power revealed in the uniqueness of one of His creatures: a uniqueness that is fully manifest only to the vision of love.

However much our looseness or extravagance of language may blur the distinction, I think we are naturally aware that worship belongs to God alone, and that 'the adoration felt or shown for a person' (from the dictionary definition) can fairly be given the name worship only when the person is the vehicle or instrument of the power of God. We do not worship human persons. If we say we do, it is either by poetic licence or dotage. The Roman Catholic does not worship the Pope; he reveres him.

This discrimination between worship and reverence must be fairly late in our use of language: for we have the paradox that whereas fathers in God are reverend, as they ought to be, mayors are worshipful, which they certainly ought not to be. I have not the great *Oxford English Dictionary* by me to trace the history of the discrimination, but probably the paradox arises from the confluence

and competition of a Latin and a Saxon word. The verbs 'revere' and 'worship' may once have been virtual synonyms, which may have been distinguished practically by the application of the former to the ecclesiastical, the latter to the secular sphere. However that may be, it is certainly true that worship now denotes a higher attitude than reverence; and we may say, roundly, that the attitude of worship is possible only in relation to, or even only in the presence of, God.

And that is true, no matter how we understand God. I believe that the attitude of worship is possible, and indeed familiar, to many who would reject any formulated theology. Many would testify that the Quaker meeting for worship can be at least as fully permeated by a sense of the divine presence as the celebration of the glorious and time-hallowed ritual of the Catholic Church. But even in the more debatable realms of purely individual experience, the attitude of worship is distinct and recognizable. I may take a single and sufficiently eccentric example, from a very personal experience.

My first reading of Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* impressed me very deeply indeed. It came to me definitely as a revelation, whereby I seemed to comprehend modern society from a new and quite unfamiliar angle. Marx's vision of industrial society as an essentially new form of human society, so much more closely integrated by the new relations of production, that it could be understood only when it was regarded as generically different from previous forms of society, made a revolutionary impact upon my consciousness. While the immediate influence of this great book was still strong upon me, I happened to go for a walk with a companion to whom I was expounding some of Marx's revolutionary theses. Our walk took us across the suspension bridge at Chelsea, which must, in its day, have been one of the more amazing achievements of capitalist industrialism. Quite suddenly, I was overwhelmed by the thought that the great bridge on which we were walking was the embodiment of the labour of thousands of forgotten men: of the labours, too, of now obsolete machines, which in their turn had been the embodiment of human labour. And it seemed to me almost as though the great bridge was alive, in some strange mode of existence. I am afraid my companion must have thought me a little mad when I stopped and put my hand on one of the iron stanchions and adjured him to understand what it was, and what it meant.

To use a discrimination of Wordsworth's, though I can remember only vaguely what I felt, I remember very distinctly how I felt; and the attitude was unmistakably one of worship, almost of sudden adoration. And though I should find it quite impossible to describe or define the God in whose presence I felt myself to be, and whom I was worshipping, there was and is no doubt of His reality or His divinity.

But the point of such an experience is that it is, in such cases, the attitude of worship itself which is the warrant of God's presence. That is not to imply that the subjective experience predominates over the objective reality; but that the subjective experience of the worshipper may be altogether more distinct than the conception of the object of his worship.

With this clue we may return to our former triad awe—worship—adoration. We feel awe before the mystery of the unknown. There is nothing specifically religious in the experience of awe; whereas worship and adoration are, I think, specifically religious. Speaking tentatively and roughly, we may perhaps say that as the unknown which is the object or occasion of awe is partly comprehended, awe passes into worship. The comprehension is partial, even fragmentary; but some degree of comprehension there must be, enough at least to heighten our awareness of the infinite beyond our comprehension. Adoration, on the other hand, seems to require a fuller degree of comprehension, and of definiteness in the object of adoration. My use of these words may, I fear, be somewhat arbitrary: but such arbitrariness seems necessary to express one's thought. And I will risk offending by saying that to me it would be more natural to describe my attitude towards Christ as one of adoration rather than worship. The trinitarian formula fits my experience like a glove and enables me to explicate it. Towards God the Father, awe, towards God the Son, adoration; towards both together, and the Spirit whereby they are apprehensible to me as a trinity in unity, worship. The Spirit 'who together with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified'—the phrase has always satisfied me deeply.

Does this appear to conflict with my claim that the attitude that came to me on the suspension bridge at Chelsea was essentially an attitude of worship? I do not think so. For my claim was not that such an attitude of worship has the same validity as the worship of the Triune God; but, first, that worship is distinct and distinguishable from awe on the one hand, and adoration on the other; and, second, that the subjective experience of the worshipper may be altogether more distinct than the conception of the object of his worship. These contentions do not appear to me to conflict at all with the conviction that the Triune God of Christianity is the most perfect object of worship. If, as I contend, the attitude of worship is possible only in relation to, or in the presence of God, and if, as I also contend, in the attitude of worship,

awe, and adoration combine and condition one another to produce the third attitude which includes both awe and adoration and yet is neither, but verily a third and unique thing—then, the God whose nature is such that He must call forth this complex yet simple harmony of attitudes, is God indeed. I would not suggest, for one moment, that when I worshipped on the bridge, I was conscious that I was worshipping the Triune God. Assuredly I was not. And, although my after-thinking might enable me to establish the identity between them, I would build little on an interpretation that might to others be far-fetched. For me it is enough that the experience on the bridge was isolated, and beyond my power to recapture. I believe that I stood then in the presence of God, and that I worshipped Him. There was awe and adoration in my worship—awe of the power which could so transfigure an object so familiar to me, and make me conscious of the divine creativeness that informed it; adoration of the anonymous human labour that was embodied in this great work of man—but both awe and adoration were lost in my worship of the God who was thus revealed to me.

But man cannot live by momentary revelations. They are the unpredictable bounty of God, who vouchsafes to us fleeting glimpses of His omnipresence. We can, and we should, cultivate as many modes of divine contemplation as we are capable of. There is, for example, much sustenance for the religious soul to be derived from following the contemplative path indicated by William Blake when he said, 'I can stare at a knot in a piece of wood until it terrifies me.' Awe, imaginative awe, before the sheer mystery of the existence of the simplest things; wonder that they should be what they are—thus and not otherwise—this will ever be a royal and direct road into some small but overwhelming knowledge of the unfathomable nature of God the Father. But to bring us near to God in His fullness, we need Christ, and to ascend through Christ to an awareness of the nature of the Triune God. That nature calls forth worship in the full sense of the word.

But this complete worship of the Christian God is to be regarded as a culmination and consummation of worship in other modes; it does not supersede, but crowns them. And it seems to me that, through neglect of this truth, there has been a gradual but grave degeneration of worship, and, in consequence, of our conception of God. The concentration of worship into a particular service of worship on a particular day is, in itself, a necessity of the religious life, which needs these regular moments of withdrawal from the sheer multiplicity of worldly cares. A space of quiet is made both in our lives and souls wherein, by contemplation of the nature of God, we may (as Coleridge put it) become 'all permeable by a higher Power.' Our receptivity is heightened by the ordered ritual of devotion. But a merely passive acquiescence, though no bad thing in itself, is a very imperfect worship. Worship at its best demands a continuous effort of the mind to understand and an equally continuous acceptance by the imagination of the impossibility of understanding.

It is precisely this fullness of worship which is impeded by the tendency to distort concentration into segregation of worship: in a particular service and a particular day. The tendency itself is inevitable, simply because the religious life and the workaday life are necessarily always in a condition of tension with each other. But in a modern technological civilization the tension has become separation; the polarity, antithesis. I remember well one day when I accompanied Eric Gill into the lunch-room of a London Hotel, before a Committee to which we both belonged. As we sat down, his eye roamed round the room, taking in its mechanical decoration and tawdry elegance. Then he said, quietly and firmly, 'There is *nothing* holy here!' It was too true. The room was dead. It would have needed a stupendous, and somehow an inhuman, imagination to discover amid all its lifeless paraphernalia a theme for the glorification of God. The heavens may declare His handiwork, but not in these days the most characteristic works of man.

This gulf between our religion and our daily lives seems to me by far the profoundest problem of religion to-day. And it is hard indeed to define the nature of the gulf. There are characteristic creations of modern technology which can and should be regarded as possessing their own holiness. I do not believe that my experience on the bridge was simply a subjective fantasy; and it so happens that the particular bridge has often captured my sense with its æsthetic charm, though nothing was more remote from my mind on that occasion than its mere beauty. But that beauty, I suppose, is what would now be called functional, and derives from a severe and subtle solution of a problem of pure engineering, uncontaminated by ornamental elegances. But it seems that many other constructions, which to my sense are quite brutally ugly, might just as well have aroused in me the same overwhelming awareness of them as the embodiment of human labour. As far as my intellect can judge, it was an accident that my bridge happened to be beautiful. It is another voice than that of the intellect which insists that it was not an accident at all.

But that brings me no nearer to defining the nature of the gulf that exists between our religion and our daily lives in a technological civilization. Modern technology has created some beautiful and

many ugly things ; but I see no reason to suppose that the satisfaction of the worker is greater when he helps to create the beautiful than when he helps to create the ugly thing. For the master-engineer, the man who solved the problem and designed the bridge, it may be so ; probably it is so. He creates the plan of an harmonious whole and rejoices in his work. But for the humble machine-minder who controls the machine that makes the bolts ; and the humble riveter who clinches them—there appears to be no such satisfaction. He is a mere 'hand,' a still necessary adjunct to the machine. His personality can find no expression in his work. There would be the devil to pay if it did. And this impossibility of finding creative satisfaction in one's daily work holds good—it seems to me—of the great majority of workers in a technological civilization. The leaders of the Churches may declare that 'a sense of divine vocation must be restored to man's daily work' ; but they give no hint how it is to be done.

Whether or not they are the same thing, I cannot conceive a sense of 'divine vocation' in a man's daily work apart from a sense of creative self-fulfilment in that work. Yet it seems to stand in the very nature of a machine-civilization that this cannot be. Abstractly, perhaps, a solution is conceivable at the time when the work of the machines is so highly developed, and the economic obstacles to their full functioning so completely removed, that machine-work will take up a mere fraction of human energies. The forty-hour week which was near to becoming a reality even between the wars may be reduced to the twenty-hour week. The real emphasis and centre of a man's working-life will then, willy-nilly, be in his leisure. And it is theoretically conceivable that a new kind of work —the work of leisure, inclination, and positive desire: work which, under the present dispensation, has the slightly contemptuous status of a 'hobby' —will become the main interest of man.

But this millennium—if millennium it be—seems very remote. In the condition in which we actually are, men's work demands the greater part of their energies and their waking life ; and it is work of a kind that produces a deep frustration of their instinctive lives. This profound and primary frustration I believe to be much the most powerful among the many causes of modern war. Yet modern war merely intensifies the frustration. It brings a temporary salve to the running wound of mass-unemployment, indeed, but it does this at the cost of subordinating men to the machine more completely than before. From the large-scale sociological point of view the mass-unemployed are merely transformed into the mass-army. The employed are still more mechanically and monotonously employed than before.

And, of course, it hardly needs emphasis that total war is obviously the supreme form of life-frustration. In it the life-frustration which is fundamental to the technological civilization, at any rate in the form in which we experience it, assumes colossal, almost cosmic proportions. Its essence is made brutally manifest ; its nature is known by its works. If that be true (as I believe), we can see in its true proportions the depth of the gulf which separates religion from man's daily life to-day. It is more than a gulf; it is an abyss. And, in so far as men's religion is real, it will of necessity be a religion which recognizes and somehow justifies this abyss. The recent growth of Barthianism seems to me significant of this. But for the majority of men this situation will merely produce a sense of entire alienation from religion. It will become for them an eccentric irrelevance. In a tiny and apparently insignificant minority, an awareness of their desperate predicament may engender the revolutionary determination to make their daily work holy, no matter what the cost may be. They will need to be fairly heroic souls, for the cost will not be slight.

From this angle, the fundamental problem of restoring worship is to establish some kind of real connexion between men's daily experience, the actual texture of their lives, and their ordered and regular worship of God. Unless such worship can be felt to be in some sort a consummation and purification of their workaday lives, unless that work and that life can be conceived naturally, that is, without some impossible intellectual subtlety, as a fairly straightforward offering to God, religious worship must become more and more the recondite refuge of the few who are capable of despair, and the protocol of professionals.

I do not deny, for one moment, that the spectacle of the world to-day is capable of producing a truly religious response. On the contrary, I believe that worship of God—in the threefold sense in which I have used the word awe, worship, adoration—is the response to which the human mind is ultimately compelled by this same spectacle. The judgment of God on this civilization is visible and terrible. But precisely those who accept this view of our present misery, as a divine judgment upon a way of life which we all share, and the guilt of which rests impartially upon all the great nations of the West, are most deeply convinced that worship is impossible without repentance and the works that are the fruit of repentance. And, if my reading of the situation be true, the only works of repentance that are relevant are those which struggle to discover and to establish a way of life which is free from the fundamental frustration which drives towards death and finds its consummation in mechanized and total war.

Such a new way of life, offering creative fulfilment for the individual person, would be a way of life which could be, not extravagantly, conceived and experienced as an act of worship in itself. The supersession of the egotistic self-consciousness in simple devotion to the job in hand, as a thing worth doing in itself, apart from all thought of monetary reward—this must become a commonplace of experience in the lives of ordinary folk if their formal religious worship is to be more than an eccentric and irrelevant interlude, without any deep and enduring connexion with their real selves. So long as it remains without that organic connexion with their daily attitudes, so long will religious worship be exotic and precarious in the life of society: unable to compete with the attraction of the cinema for the allegiance of the mass-man. The cinema is, at least, homogeneous with the life-style of the modern man. It is an amusement-machine which demands as little from his imagination as the machine with which he works demands from his instinct. He will worship at the Gaumont Palace, so long as he works at the conveyor-belt.

This is a large-scale generalization. The disease of a mass-society cannot be diagnosed by other means. There are, and probably will always be, the faithful or fanatical few to whom religious worship is a necessary sustenance. But they are very few. Shortly before Christmas last I happened to be on a Sunday in one of our great manufacturing cities that had been devastated by the 'blitz.' Here if anywhere (I said to myself) there will be signs of the return to God. I saw none. I went to two churches: there were not a dozen worshippers between them. I was told that there was one fairly popular Church, with an outstanding priest, where I might hope to find a congregation of 100. I did not have time to visit it. But staring me in the face in the centre of the city was a queue of at least 500 waiting to enter, and pay for entering, one cinema; and another half the size outside another. Therefore, though it may be an exaggeration, it is a perfectly legitimate exaggeration to say that the cinema is the mass-man's church to-day. There he worships: there his need for awe and adoration is satisfied.

And surely we should be lacking in imagination were we to expect it to be otherwise. Worship cannot be wrenched apart from the texture of man's daily life: if it is, the worshipper has to wrench himself apart mentally, if he is to remain faithful to it. Such a wrenching-apart of oneself may be a valuable act of self-humiliation for the few who are capable of making it a positive experience; but for the many it is simply intolerable. If religious worship is to become, once more, an almost natural activity for the majority of men, it must be the consummation, not the contradiction of their working lives.

Again, I would not deny that in a very real and agonizing sense the worship of Christ crucified is, indeed, the consummation of men's daily lives to-day. But Christian worship in that supreme sense gives a devastating insight into our condition to-day. The insight is too devastating. The munition-worker who exposed himself to it, would be exposing himself to a power that might well incapacitate him for being a munition-worker. It is a sound instinct of self-preservation which carries him past the Church-door to the cinema: for the movies are a much more effective drug than passive worship in a church, and a much less dangerous stimulant than active worship in one. We cannot have it both ways—not in 1942. If Christian worship is to be real, then men's lives are seen to be what they are—a nightmare, and they must make the best they can of that fearful discovery. If Christian worship is perfunctory, then there is no possible ground of quarrel with the masses who prefer their opium in what they consider to be more interesting, more comfortable and more palatable forms.

I have considered worship, in these last paragraphs, more as a social than an individual act: partly because I believe that no society can be truly healthy unless corporate religious worship is a natural activity for the great majority of its members, partly because I believe that Christian worship, experienced as an intense act by the individual, leads necessarily to the realization why corporate religious worship is unnatural to-day, and to a correspondingly ardent longing that it should become natural once more. You cannot keep the Christian imagination in blinkers. Kindle it in individual worship, and the flame illuminates the whole predicament of society. It cannot do less, if it is indeed the truth. And to kindle the Christian imagination is the necessary effect of worship. The awe and adoration which are blent in worship, are blent in imagination too. Imagination is the intellect at worship. You invoke it at your peril, for it is not obedient to your purposes. It makes you obedient to its own.

Literature.

REDEMPTION AND REVELATION.

A NEW addition to the Library of Constructive Theology is assured of a ready welcome; all the more as coming from the hand of Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, the distinguished joint-editor of the Series. It is more than thirty years since this writer issued his valuable, and still valuable, study of the Christian doctrine of man. In the interval he has given much further thought to the subject of Christian doctrine generally, viewed in the light of the appeal to religious experience. The emphasis in the study above-named was psychological. It is metaphysical or philosophical in his subsequent study, issued in 1928, of 'The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit.' In the study now under review, *Redemption and Revelation* (Nisbet; 12s. 6d. net), the emphasis is historical.

The three works may make a 'trilogy,' but it is in no formal sense. For they are largely the product of the working life of a teacher and preacher of the Christian faith, and the matter contained in them has been shaped as occasion has arisen, and not in deference to any elaborate systematic plan. The influence of the occasional is more obvious in this third work than in either of its predecessors. In this third work, as it may be added, there is an increased use of literary instance and allusion; and for that many readers will be grateful.

We have said that in this last of the 'trilogy' it is an historical emphasis we meet with. The author feels that the 'actuality of history' supplies a line of approach (to the subjects of revelation and redemption) to which sufficient attention has not been paid. By the conception of the 'actuality of history' he means 'the aspect of human life which sees it as the realistic achievement of eternal values in the unique category of time.' The term 'actuality' is to be preferred to the term 'reality,' as avoiding, or rather postponing, the philosophical problems attaching to any use of this latter term, whilst at the same time claiming for the event so much more than the mere conception of it.

In this book revelation and redemption are regarded as different aspects of the 'actuality of history.' The revelation made by the Christian gospel is one of redemption, of a redemption which God has wrought in Christ, and which is completed in the actual change effected in human hearts and lives. The redemption through Christ supplies the supreme revelation of God, and the revelation itself becomes the cardinal factor in changing and transforming character.

It is difficult in a few words to give an adequate impression of the rich and varied contents of the book. Special mention may be made of the chapters in Part I. (The Actuality of History) entitled the Ministry of Error and the Symbolism of Language; of the chapters in Part II. (The Media of Revelation) entitled the Physical Media, the Psychical Media, and History and Revelation; and of the chapters in Part III. (The Fact of Redemption) entitled the Meaning of Redemption and the Redemptive Suffering.

The standpoint of the whole may be characterized as liberal evangelical, and it may be said to define itself as against much of the so widely prevalent neo-conservatism. If we were to narrow down the issue between liberal evangelicalism and present-day conservatism, it might be resolved into the question, Is there, or is there not, any kinship between God and man? That there is such a kinship Dr. Wheeler Robinson contends; not only did it exist before the 'Fall,' it has persisted since the 'Fall' (however that doctrine be interpreted). 'However transcendent God is, the point at which He reveals Himself to us must be a point at which He becomes intelligible to us, that is, a point at which there is kinship between His nature and ours.'

He adds, 'Unless there is kinship, God's spiritual activities must forever remain unintelligible to man, and there can be no revelation and no redemption involving man's responsive activity. Unless there is kinship, we renounce the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the indwelling Christ, continuing His work from within the human spirit. Unless there is kinship, the goal of life as fellowship with God becomes inconceivable. "Now are we the sons of God and it doth not yet appear what we shall be."'

The Barthian would have something to say at this point, and Dr. Wheeler Robinson anticipates, and thinks to counter, what he would say: 'If it be said that the adoption into that sonship is already an act of grace, and implies no "natural" kinship, the sufficient answer is that such adoption can make actual only that which was potential, and potential kinship is already kinship, even if a kinship far below the level of the conscious relation of the Christian to God, and a kinship temporarily denied by man's sin.' W. FULTON.

GOOD AND EVIL SPIRITS.

On the basis of a thesis which was accepted by the University of London for the degree of Doctor of Divinity, the Rev. Edward Langton, B.D., R.H.S., and Member of the Royal Asiatic Society, has written a notable book on *Good and Evil Spirits*, with the sub-title, 'A Study of the Jewish and Christian Doctrine, its Origin and Development' (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net). Since the time of Schürer much excellent work has been done in study of Judaism as it was at the beginning of the Christian era. It is universally acknowledged that this study is essential for understanding of Jesus, St. Paul, and the New Testament generally. What has been hitherto lacking is a genetic and comparative study of that Judaism itself. Dr. Oesterley recently gave us a work which clearly pointed the way. Mr.

Langton, selecting one very important field of research, has gone deeper than Dr. Oesterley could with his less restricted investigation. Behind Judaism in which the New Testament took its rise there lies as every one knows the Old Testament. But what lies behind the Old Testament? However unique the religious achievement of Israel, Israel was in close contact with other peoples, and shared in 'world-views' current throughout its varying history. Belief in spirits, good and evil, was immemoriably old before Israel appeared, and Mr. Langton's view is that to understand what Jewish belief was and how Jewish religious thought on the subject developed and how far it was original, a preliminary study is needed of the pre-Jewish development of thought.

The first portion of the volume therefore deals concisely with 'Primitive Conceptions,' and the first question raised is how did belief in a spirit separable from body arise? Who shall maintain that he can tell the thoughts or expound the mental processes of primitive man? Mr. Langton acknowledges the difficulty and warns himself and his readers against the 'psychologist's fallacy' of reading back from one's own mental processes to those of the primitives. But with that caveat attempts may reasonably be made to say what were the probable factors in the genesis of this belief. Mr. Langton gives due place to the probable influence of dreams, memory-images, 'psychic' phenomena and the like; but holds that most essential was an intuitive or instinctive sense of some mysterious power operating in man and in the world. The belief that man's own spirit survives death is practically universal and no doubt can be entertained that the early Hebrews held it; archæology has proved that they did. There is much else in this first section that is worth mention did space permit. We have admirable and admirably concise treatment of such conceptions as tabu, animatism, animism, mana, fetish, and totem.

In the second and much larger section Mr. Langton investigates the origin and progress of the Jewish views of departed spirits, their location, occupations, and so on. As Dr. Oesterley points out in the highly commendatory foreword he has written, Mr. Langton rightly devotes considerable space to an examination of Apocrypha and Apocalyptic. In the age which produced that literature, Jewish ideas, especially with regard to Sheol, underwent noteworthy change. The importance of this lies here—that this literature constitutes the immediate background of the New Testament writings.

Mr. Langton has given us a learned and scholarly work on a subject of great interest. And it is written in such fine literary style that one is enthralled. One can compare it in this respect only with Lang's 'Making of Religion' which reads like a well-written novel. W. D. Niven.

A THEOLOGICAL VADE-MECUM.

In his Alexander Robertson Lectures, delivered last year in the University of Glasgow, Professor John Baillie of the Chair of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh, invites his readers to accompany him on the journey whose end is the eternal City of God. He is well aware of the doubts, hesitancies, and misunderstandings that keep men from setting out on this pilgrim way; but he hopes that by indicating the foundations of his own religious faith and the true nature of the life to which as Christians we are called, he will enable some at least to throw off their unbelief and make the great decision and venture. The Lectures are entitled *Invitation to Pilgrimage* (Milford; 5s. net).

At the outset Dr. Baillie explains with engaging candour how he has no choice but to set his own feet upon the Christian way of pilgrimage. Since his early days he has been conscious of a 'transcendent authority' under which he stands, of the 'sovereign constraint' of One who claims him for His own. On this consciousness his religious faith is founded.

What has Dr. Baillie to say to those who do not possess such consciousness? It is not enough to defend the reasonableness of his theistic interpretation of experience. He feels he must maintain that, whether men are aware of it or not, the sense of transcendent authority and sovereign constraint is the fundamental fact of their whole spiritual life.

As for the true nature of the life to which men are called through Christ, this is the theme which chiefly fills these pages. Dr. Baillie is of the opinion of most modern apologists for the Christian religion that the dogmatic approach is to be preferred to the older apologetic one. He would allow the gospel to carry its own conviction. All that the apologist need attempt to do is, in the spirit of St. Anselm, to present the Christian faith in a reasonable light. This, as it appears to the present writer, Dr. Baillie has succeeded in doing; and his success is largely due to a combination of spiritual understanding, historical insight, and balanced reflectiveness.

It is a clear picture of the Christian life that is here drawn, and it should appeal to the minds of those who would be at once catholic and evangelical. With extreme types of Protestant theology Dr. Baillie would have no traffic. In his own pilgrimage he seems to have known what it is to travel from the direction of the left to the centre; and if he sometimes casts his eyes a little wistfully to the right, he soon pulls himself up and pursues his middle course.

Unless the catholic be also evangelical in his view of the gospel forgiveness and reconciliation Dr. Baillie is disappointed in him. He is also disappointed in the evangelical whose interest appears to lie in forgiveness and reconciliation alone. If he writes, 'It is only on the basis of the justification of my still unsanctified self that my sanctification can begin,' he also writes, 'A justification that does not issue in sanctification is no true justification at all.'

As one might expect, there is much that is topical in even a small book by a theologian of Dr. Baillie's vitality. Two points specially

emphasized are the bankruptcy of humanistic individualism and rationalism and the insufficiency—not to speak of the present moral perversity, what Reinhold Niebuhr would call the 'synthetic barbarism'—of totalitarianism. It would certainly appear from these things that this is a day of opportunity for the Christian Church. On the one hand, the Christian Church has always enshrined within its formulas humanistic ideals of freedom and individuality, enlightenment and progress; on the other, the Christian Church has always offered life in a totalitarian community or fellowship. But its humanism and totalitarianism are not anthropocentric, and so likely to come to confusion, but theocentric. All this, and much more, Dr. Baillie expresses with his customary eloquence and felicity. W. FULTON.

ARCHÆOLOGY AND THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

The four Ayer Lectures of the Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, New York, which were given in 1940–41 by W. F. Albright, Ph.D., Litt.D., the well-known Professor of Semitic Languages in the John Hopkins University, have now been expanded by him into an attractive and informative volume, *Archæology and the Religion of Israel* (John Hopkins Press, Baltimore; $2.25). The author is to be congratulated on this book, which is not only of interest to experts, but is thoroughly readable throughout by any layman, even though he may have only a superficial knowledge of the subjects dealt with. It gives an excellent authoritative description of the background of Old Testament religion, both early and late, Canaanite as well as Israelite, and in addition there are forty-four closely printed pages of Notes and References, which will prove an undoubted help to students of Near-Eastern archæology. An adequate index completes a most valuable collection of information.

Professor Albright has much to say on the Near-Eastern mind in his first chapter, but he has wisely avoided psychological and similar problems, especially as these are passing at present through a period of readjustment. The book is so well based on authentic evidence, carefully and cautiously interpreted, that there is little to criticise. In his vigorous condemnation of the 'Negebite' hypothesis (in connexion with the Ugaritic documents), he is probably correct, as this view was never more than a supposition based on the early translations of Virolleaud, but it is doubtful whether his rejection of identity between several ritual or sacrificial terms (such as *kalîl*) in the Ugaritic texts and the Old Testament is justified. Numerous scholars will not agree with his chronology, which remains very low, especially for the second millennium B.C. (the First Dynasty of Babylon is placed 1900–1600 B.C., and the Code of Hammurabi *c.* 1750 B.C.). His theory that the Israelites were not typical nomads, as their tradition represents them as settling down almost at once at the Conquest, following on their destruction of the Canaanite towns, may be true in so far as their nomadism differed from the Bedouin ideal found in Arab literature, but the theory is largely necessitated by his late date for the Exodus and Conquest. In reality, the Israelite settlement was of a gradual and very prolonged nature, as we know from the earliest and most authentic sources.

Professor Albright's view is worthy of note that a 'rational conservative' attitude to the Old Testament has less to fear from the new material than either of the extreme positions. 'There can be no doubt,' he states, 'that archæology has confirmed the substantial historicity of Old Testament tradition' (p. 176). And, perhaps more important still, he says, 'unless we can continue along the pathway of personal morality and spiritual growth which was marked out for civilized man by the founders of the Judæo-Christian tradition, more than two thousand years ago, our superior skill in modifying and even in transforming the material world about us can lead only to repeated disasters, each more terrible than its predecessor' (p. 34). Wise words for the present day! J. W. JACK.

Responsible people in America are doing what our own leaders are attempting, seeking to awaken the minds of at least the Christian community to the gravity of the problems that await solution after the war. Among the Americans Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam takes a high place, and he has just issued through the Abingdon-Cokesbury Press ($1.75), the Merrick Lectures which he delivered in 1941 at Ohio Wesleyan University. The title is *By this Sign Conquer.* Briefly the substance of this interesting book is contained in a phrase of his own: 'Contemporary crucifixions are the prelude to crusades.' The book deals with the familiar questions we are all putting to ourselves: What is to be the shape of the post-war world? What part is the Christian Church to have in answering that question? What obstacles have we to surmount? What place is the individual to have in this, and What place the community? His answers are very unlike those of our own Mr. Middleton Murry, but in one respect they agree. There will be urgent need of leadership, and the one sufficient leader is Christ. This is a good book, well-informed and inspiring.

For many years it has been the custom at Harvard to begin the day with a service in the College Chapel strictly limited to fifteen minutes. These services were made widely known a generation ago through Professor Peabody's 'Mornings in the College Chapel.' More recently Professor A. C. Reid gave a series of similar addresses which are now published under the title of *Invitation to Worship* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, Nashville; $1.50). There are fifty addresses in all, each of them inevitably very brief, But all of them compact, thoughtful, and Scriptural. They make pleasant and stimulating reading and they should provide preachers with a wealth of suggestion.

Psychology and Religious Truth, by Emeritus Principal Thomas Hywel Hughes, D.Litt., D.D. (Allen and Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), is the expansion of lectures 'given to the Theological Faculty of Bangor University College in May, 1941.' They are distinguished by great lucidity and reasonableness. There is perhaps a tendency to credit psychology with more than is its due, but there can be no doubt that Principal Hughes has much that is fresh to say on such topics as the doctrine of the Trinity, Christology, the Atonement and the religious life generally as viewed from the standpoint of modern psychology. At the same time he has a wholesome word of warning to students of theology. 'Don't preach psychology. Preach the gospel. Let your psychology be the handmaid of the gospel, and not the gospel the slave of psychology, for psychology has no saving power. Such power is in the grace of God, but psychology may help you to understand how His grace saves.'

It is fitting that this year the Baptist Churches should be celebrating the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Baptist Missionary Society. In this connexion Dr. F. Townley Lord has published a short history of the B.M.S. under the title of *Achievement* (Carey Press; 2s. 6d. net). He has a thrilling story to tell and in spite of necessarily severe compression he succeeds in making the thrill felt. Beginning with Carey and his colleagues of the famous Serampore triumvirate, Marshman and Ward, names of world-wide renown appear on his pages—Judson of Burma, Grenfell of the Congo, Timothy Richards of China, while the achievements and sufferings of many others, no less worthy if less well known, are recorded. A concluding chapter deals with the war and the world-outlook of to-day. From this survey Dr. Lord concludes, 'You cannot any longer dismiss a missionary enthusiast, as unhappily some have been fond of doing, as a person who has a "certain sentimentality towards the poor heathen." He is now properly to be described as a person who can read the signs of the times, and who knows that without Christ the sum of human striving is vanity.'

St. Mark and the Transfiguration Story, by the Rev. G. H. Boobyer, B.A., B.D., D.Th. (T. and T. Clark; 6s. net), is a piece of accurate and scholarly work. The writer, after surveying the original nature of the Transfiguration story and modern theories of its significance, proceeds to a fresh examination of Mark. In accordance with certain interpretations found in the literature of the Early Church he argues that the story was not 'a divine confirmation of the Messiahship in the form of a manifestation of Jesus in the glory of His exaltation in heaven, or in the glory of His resurrection,' but rather 'a manifestation of Christ in the glory of His second coming.' A minute examination of the Marcan narrative is held to substantiate, or at least make probable, this view.

To Christian England, by Mr. John Armitage (Longmans; 5s. net), is a sound, modest, earnest analysis of the situation to-day in our own country. The contents of the book rather belie the title, for in the ruthless picture of our social sins there does not often appear even a small corner that is Christian. Perhaps this suggestion is hardly fair, for there is an optimistic note about the future due to the author's conviction that an awakening of the soul of our people is already taking place. But the value of the book as a contribution to social and Christian reform lies in two things; first, in the frankness and ability of his exposure of our shortcomings in regard to social well-being; and, secondly, in some positive suggestions he makes towards the building up of a better system. His main suggestions are for a 'Family House,' and a 'Research Centre.' The former is very like one of the radical measures designed by the Nazi regime in Germany though arrived at independently, and the latter seems to be the product of the author's own initiative. The details of these must be sought in the book, which on all grounds is to be welcomed as an intelligent and forceful review of our present discontents and duties.

Mr. Randall T. Pittman, B.A., Dip.Ed., of Melbourne, has written a very interesting little book on *Words and their Ways in the Greek New Testament* (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net). It is designed for Bible students and teachers who have not the equipment necessary to probe into the question of translation but are interested in the results of such inquiries. It is in two parts. The first deals with New Testament metaphor, pictures in words, rare words, and so on. The most recent lexicography and commentaries have been studied to good purpose and no doubt many will find new and interesting light upon some familiar text.

The second part deals with persons, places, and incidents: for example, Bethlehem, Paidagogos, 'this babbler,' 'too superstitious,' Gallio, Claudius Cæsar, Pergamum.

For its purpose, which is well designed, it will serve admirably.

The latest Penguin Special in the religious series is Dr. A. C. Bouquet's *Comparative Religion* (6d. net). It is a fascinating story the author has to tell, and few are so competent to do it justice. Though he is a clergyman of the Church of England Dr. Bouquet writes with a serene impartiality, doing justice to every religion and exhibiting an engaging sympathy with the truth in each. More than once he evinces an appreciation of polytheism, for example, contending that it satisfies something in us, that it has given a certain freedom of mind at some stages, encouraged men to adventure, and forwarded the march of civilization! It is impossible in a brief notice to give any account of the rich store of information about the world religions the writer provides. It is sufficient to say that all religions are carefully described both in the way of history and in that of interpretation. The full mind of the author constantly spills out interesting little facts, such as that of the Hindu

student taking a course of bio-chemistry and at the same time sacrificing marigolds and rice to the image of a goddess, or that of the Buddhist priest investigating the methods used at St. Martin-in-the-Fields! But the book as a whole is learned, comprehensive, broad-minded and, above all, interesting.

The 'Teachers' Guides to Religious Education' are designed to help teachers who are using any of the agreed syllabuses. Volume II. of the series for juniors has just been published—*Jesus and the Kingdom*, edited by Mr. Ernest H. Hayes (Religious Education Press; 4s. net). Mr. Hayes founded and edited the 'Concise Guides,' and those who are familiar with his earlier work of this kind will know what to expect in the 'Teachers' Guides.' To others it may be said that the lessons are laid out with skill and knowledge, and will assist competent and incompetent alike. Some people will think that teachers are here spoon-fed and that the editor has left them nothing to do but reproduce what he has given. But there are not a few teachers who feel quite lost in this subject and need all the help they can get. And it is surely desirable that on any terms the subject should be efficiently taught. To the conscientious teacher who knows the way these helps will give material which will save him much time and which he can use with intelligence.

In *The Ministry and the Eucharist* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net) that well-known upholder of the Anglican and Catholic tradition, Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, seeks to show with reference to the celebrant of the Eucharist what the Historic Episcopate and the Priesthood actually represent. First, he considers the actions and the principles of the Episcopal Ministry 'in the Church of the centuries'; then the actions and the principles of the Church of England before and after the Reformation; and, finally, the modern theories and innovations propounded during the last fifty years, and their effect on the prospects of Reunion. His own standpoint appears in his declared conviction that in view of the divine guidance bestowed on the Collective Episcopate of Christendom no section of the Church by itself has authority to depart from the Church's main traditions. In particular, and in the special context of the South India Reunion Scheme, he is emphatic on the point that no section of the Church by itself has authority to commission a layman to consecrate the Eucharist. He cites the endorsement of this principle by Presbyterians as represented by the Scottish Church Society. He concludes, and his words give a further indication of his standpoint, 'In the interests of the ultimate reunion of all the Episcopal Communions it is essential that each local episcopate should maintain inviolate its constitutional identity with the Episcopate of the ages, not only in ministerial forms but also in ministerial principles.'

Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net), is the subject of the Norrisian Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge for the year 1940. The author is the Rev. C. W. Dugmore, B.D., M.A., late Sub-Warden of St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, whose hope is to draw attention in this volume to the contributions in the field of Eucharistic Doctrine made by the seventeenth and early eighteenth century divines in England. It is a learned and scholarly volume, and Mr. Dugmore has succeeded in presenting his subject in a wide setting of contemporary history, both of Church and State.

Hooker had no desire to dwell upon metaphysical questions, such as those of consubstantiation and transubstantiation, but sought to transfer the emphasis from the less to the greater, indeed to concentrate upon the truth of the real participation in the sacrament in the body and blood of Christ. In this he forms the link between the early reformers and the moderate or Central Churchmen of the controversial period which lay ahead, of whom Archbishop Ussher was an early representative.

As for Waterland, who belongs to the close of the period under review, Central Churchmanship may be said to be the basis of his doctrine of the Eucharist. He rejects Romanist, Lutheran, Calvinist, and Zwinglian opinions about the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and in him the *via media* reaches its triumph. His *Review* (1937) was once considered almost as the textbook of the Church of England on the subject of the Eucharist. He asserts that the symbols in the Eucharist, while remaining bread and wine after consecration, contract a relative holiness by their consecration; just as thrones or crowns are, in a lower sense, relatively sacred. He also compares the sacraments with the instruments of investiture into lands, honours, and dignities; a ring or a crosier is at once an emblem of what it belongs to and a means of conveyance. Accordingly, of the bread and wine in the Eucharist he says, 'While they are made use of in the holy service, they are considered, construed, understood (pursuant to Divine law, promise, covenant), as standing for what they represent and exhibit.'

Society: Natural and Divine, by the Rev. A. P. Carleton, B.D. (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), is a book whose aim is to promote union within the Church and the Christian ordering of civil society. The writer has spent some years as a missionary in India, and his experiences there of co-operation with missionaries of other denominations and particularly of the efforts being made towards Church union, have broadened his outlook and led him to a fresh study of what the Church is. The bulk of his book is given to a study of the Church as depicted in the Old Testament and in the New, both in itself and in its relation to what he calls 'natural society.' This study is carefully and competently done. When he comes to deal with the question of Church reunion he takes for granted that monarchical episcopacy is of divine authority and essential to the being of the Church. He looks hopefully in the direction of Rome, and offers no concession to the Free

Churches. All this is set down with the utmost expression of goodwill and Christian charity, but those who do not share the sacramentarian view of the Church will feel that here is the most formidable barrier to Christian fellowship and Church union.

The Christian Church and World Order is a statement by the Commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility (S.C.M.; 4d. net). It seeks to set out, first, the central truths about world order which the Christian Revelation contains; second, the bearing of these truths upon the actual contemporary situation; and third, the special and distinctive task of the Church as the society which is called the Body of Christ. The statement here given is substantially an expansion of the famous 'ten points' of the well-known letter to *The Times*. The pamphlet is a small one but it is of great value as an expression of the Christian mind about society present and future.

The Rhythm of English Prose (especially Biblical).

By the Reverend Dr. A. H. Birch, Abergavenny, Mon.

The Greeks and, after them, the Romans made Rhetoric one of the liberal arts, but among modern nations the French alone have erected it into a subject of study and a practical accomplishment. The Greeks and the Romans discovered early that the effect upon hearers made by ordered language depended to a large extent upon rhythm, that is, the regular recurrence of stresses or 'beats' due to the rising or falling of the tone or pitch of the voice. If the words were arranged in a casual way they might jar upon or irritate hearers, but if, on the other hand, there was in them a certain measured cadence, they soothed and, in argumentative or forensic passages, convinced. Cicero knew this psychological fact quite well and often, as he boasts in his letters, convinced juries by his dexterous use of it. In one letter he tells a friend in a confidential outburst which he never dreamt would be read nearly two thousand years after, 'I didn't half pull the wool over their eyes!' In his *De Oratore*, Cicero discusses the subject at some length and uses the technical terms since stereotyped for these metrical endings, for example, Clausula and Decursus (lit. 'running down' or 'ending'). There he points out that these rhythmical endings were based upon the Cretic (—∪—) and variants of the trochee or iambus. Church writers like S. Augustine, S. Ambrose, and others carried on the tradition and swayed their congregations by the judicious use of it. The Welsh preacher's use of the 'hwyl' also depends on rises and falls in the voice and is (or was?) directed to the heart through the ear rather than to the head!

So far as I am aware, no serious work has been attempted in English on the question as to whether there is anything comparable in English oratory, though many people must have suspected that the emotional effect of oratory was not due entirely to the words themselves. But perhaps it is in the Authorized Version of the Bible that the effects produced by rhythm may best be seen, though Shakespeare's prose shows distinct traces of it, for example, in the words: 'What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! how infinite in faculty.' Here the question of reading 'a man' or 'man' must be settled entirely by the *rhythm*, for on æsthetic grounds alone 'man' or 'a man' might be equally well supported. But in the A.V. the effect of rhythm is unmistakable, especially in some of the 'purple patches.' This regular recurrence of stressed and unstressed syllables is quite clearly observable in such a passage as the well known: 'For the'y | that be' | with us' | are mor'e | than the'y | that be' | with the'm |.' This sentence has seven complete iambuses (∪—). Take again the well-known psalm: 'If I' | forge't | thee O' | Jeru's | alem' |. Let my' | right han'd | forge't | her cu'n | n(ing).' Here the last syllable is slurred and does not count metrically; the line is catalectic. Perhaps *the* outstanding orator of to-day is the Prime Minister, Mr. Winston Churchill. Whether Mr. Churchill consciously uses rhythmic effects in his great orations and whether they are elaborately prepared and 'rehearsed' or not, there is little doubt that the effect produced on hearers is partly to be attributed to the skilful way in which his words 'fall,' *i.e.* there is more design than chance about it.

He can use very short, simple words, mostly monosyllables, *e.g.* blood, toil, sweat, tears. Here there is a strong stress on every word, which produces the same effect as the classical spondee (— —), *i.e.* a certain grim solemnity. But he can also use much longer and more technical terms. When he wishes to be pungently sarcastic, for example, when he avoided the use of the harsh monosyllable 'lie' by its moral equivalent 'terminological inexactitude.' His most celebrated

effort in recent years was contained in his eulogy of the part played by the Air Force in the Battle of Britain: 'Ne'ver | i'n the | hi'story | of hu'm | an co'n | flict wa's | so mu'ch | ow'ed by | so ma'n | y to' | so fe'w.' Here the various types of metrical foot are arranged in a kind of symmetry, the three trochaic feet being balanced by three iambic feet following.

The technical name for this arrangement is *Chiasmus*, which merely means arrangement in symmetrical pairs of groups, for example, A B. B A.

A good instance of this symmetrical arrangement would be St. John's wording of Christ's interview with His disciples (recorded in Ch. 14): 'Ye believe in God, believe also in me.' In the original
A_1 B_1 A_2 B_2
Greek the collocation of the words is even more arresting, for they run thus:

'Ye believe in God, in me also believe.'

Here the *Chiasmus* takes another form, for *the Persons are put in the middle, next to each other*, the assertions *at the beginning and the end*. Can this be merely accidental or is it deliberate? One of Bernard Shaw's plays is entitled *You Never Can Tell*. Here, if you follow the strict rules of Grammar and put the word 'never' where it should be (according to the pedant's rules) the charm of the line has gone. The 'lilt,' 'swing,' 'rhythm' or 'cadence' has vanished. This tendency to rhythm in ordinary prose is probably quite unconscious and instinctive, but there must be a reason behind it, if we can discover it. Take a simple sentence like 'He thr'ew his ar'ms aroun'd my nec'k' and consider what a difference it would make if we put 'round' for 'around.' Indeed, the sentence would then suggest a policeman's grip rather than—what the other word suggests! The controlling factor in both cases is the kind of *emotion* behind the word. I am convinced that the closest scrutiny can never establish any *logical* reason for the existence of pairs of words like 'round' and 'around,' 'till' and 'until,' 'wake' and 'awake,' 'rouse' and 'arouse,' and yet there must be *some* reason. I have examined *hundreds* of instances from books and periodicals and have discovered that whether we use one or the other of the pairs depends on the smoothness of the rhythm, *i.e.* one jars, the other soothes. Poetry only differs from the best prose in being *consciously* dependent on rhythm and in *suggesting* ideas rather than in explicitly stating facts. A striking example of this *Chiasmus* or balanced equivalence of symmetrical parts is to be found in the penitential 51st Psalm: 'Wa'sh me | throu'ghly | fro'm my | si'ns and | blo't out | al'l my in | i'quities |.' Substitute 'thoroughly' for 'throughly' and the rhythm has departed. The syllable-beat is the first in each foot, the first being trochaic and the last two dactylic, an arrangement which imparts more life and variety to the line. The 'Magnificat' furnishes other examples, *e.g.* 'My so'ul | doth ma'g- | nify' | the Lor'd | and my spi'rit | hath rejoi' | ced in Go'd | my Sa'viou'r |.' Here the iambic beginning is balanced by an ending of two anapaests (∪ ∪ —) and two iambuses which are simply embryonic anapaests. The point is that the words would not run at all smoothly if they were thrown together anyhow. There is music in them, not merely sound; and music, I presume, must be based on some sort of *regularity*. Now let us take the 'Nunc Dimittis' as an illustration of this symmetry by means of contrasted parallel clauses. Thus, 'Lo'rd, now | le'ttest | tho'u thy | se'rvant | depar't | in pea'ce | accor'd | ing to' | thy wor'd | fo'r mine | ey'es have | se'en thy | salva' | tion whic'h | thou has't | prepa'red | befor'e | the fa'ce | of al'l | peo'p(le).' The balance is effected by reversing the incidence of the musical beat after the first five feet. Then further variety is added by reverting to the original beat in the last word 'people,' for there could not possibly be any stress on so invertebrate a syllable as final 'le.' Let us take our next example from the Gospel of St. John, ch. 6, *v.*[29], which runs thus: 'This is' | the wor'k | of Go'd | that ye' | believ'e | on hi'm | whom he' | hath sen't |.' This is the reply to the question: 'What sha'll | we do' | that we' | might wor'k | the wor'ks | of Go'd ? |.'

It will be noted that both question and answer are arranged in perfect iambic lines. It is just possible that in both question and answer the first foot is trochaic, *i.e.* that the stress is on 'This' and 'What' rather than on 'is' and 'shall,' but the trochee is only the iambus reversed, and the sentences would both still be rhythmical though not strictly regular. The only question is: Did the translators of the Authorized Version *aim* at producing these metrical effects, or were they unconscious? The Authorised Version as literature is universally admitted to be a masterpiece, whatever may be its defects as a translation. It is almost certainly true to say that the Golden Age of our speech was the Elizabethan, say from roughly A.D. 1550 to 1620. Within the limits of those years our greatest prose and poetry was written. If Shakespeare had not been one of these poets, there are at least three or four others who would have ranked in the very highest class. Cranmer's Collects are unique. When they are translations they excel the Latin originals (which is a very rare occurrence), and when they are original they are on a par with the translations. No higher praise than this could be given to the English of any period.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

From Print to Practice.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

'Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, *and doeth them*. . . .'—Mt 7^{24}.

Here is a story from Korea. It is told by the Bishop of Lichfield in his book *Everyday Religion*.

One day a Korean came to the house of a missionary and said he had been committing to memory some passages in the Bible: he would like to repeat them and have his memory tested. He then repeated without a slip the whole of the Sermon on the Mount!

The missionary was astonished at this feat of memory, and congratulated him; but told him that to have the words of Jesus in his memory would do him little good unless he practised them in his life. 'That,' said the Korean, 'is how I learned them.' The missionary asked him what he meant. 'Oh,' he replied, 'I am only a stupid farmer, and when I tried to memorize the words they wouldn't stick. So I hit upon this plan: I got one verse into my mind and then went out and practised it among my neighbours until I had got a firm hold of it. Then I took the next verse and did the same with it. And it brought me so much happiness that I am determined to get by heart the whole of St. Matthew's Gospel!'

He would get two things out of that plan: a good memory, and a good life. That is the way to learn the words of Jesus. It is the way He prescribed Himself. He finished the Sermon on the Mount by drawing a contrast between the man who 'heareth these sayings of mine and *doeth them*,' and the man who 'heareth these sayings of mine and *doeth them not*.' The words of Jesus are not only to be remembered; they are to be put into practice. They are not only to be stored in our memory; they are to be the strength of our life. The Word of God became Flesh in Jesus Christ, it became a living word; and the words of Jesus are to become flesh in our lives. They must become living words.

Words are only words until they become living: then they are forces, and when the words of Jesus become living words in any one's life they are very great forces.

You learn Mathematics at school, and perhaps Dynamics, and working out problems on paper is good training for the mind; but engineers and architects put them into practice, and, keeping the commandments of Mathematics and Dynamics, build houses and ships and bridges that can stand the tests of storms and time.

I read once that, when China was at peace, one of its rulers thought it would be a good thing for their people to take an interest in sport and athletics, and learn to play football. So the order was sent out that football was to be taught in all schools in the provinces. In due course reports came in that all the scholars had learned football. *But no football had been played!* They had learned the rules by heart and were letter-perfect, and they thought that was all that was needed. Of course it wasn't. To know the rules is necessary if you are going to play any game, but knowing the rules is no use at all unless you actually do play the game. The great game of life demands that we learn the rules, which are the words of Jesus, and that as we learn them we put them into practice.

Have you read *Nicholas Nickleby* by Dickens? I hope you have, and, if you haven't, that some day you will. In it there is one, Squeers, who had a school, and this is how he explained his system of teaching to Nicholas.

'"Now, then," said Squeers, "where's the first boy?" "Please, sir, he's cleaning the back-parlour window." "So he is, to be sure," rejoined Squeers. "We go upon the practical mode of teaching. . . . C-l-e-a-n, clean, verb active, to make bright, to scour. W-i-n, win, d-e-r, der, winder, a casement. When the boy knows this out of book, he goes and does it. Where's the second boy?" "Please, sir, he's weeding the garden." "To be sure," said Squeers. "So he is. B-o-t, bot, t-i-n, tin, bottin, n-e-y, ney, bottinney, noun substantive, a knowledge of plants. When he has learned that bottinney means a knowledge of plants, he goes and knows 'em. That's our system."'

Squeers was a monster of ignorance, as you may guess from his spelling, and several other sorts of monster, but he had got hold of a sound idea; that knowing a thing out of a book must be followed up by going and doing it.

A young Durham miner invited one of his mates to go with him to a meeting at the caravan of the British and Foreign Bible Society that was to be held in his neighbourhood. The latter said, 'What have you to do with the Bible Society anyway?' 'Oh,' he answered, 'I'm a translator.' 'What! you a translator?' 'Yes, I'm busy all the time translating the New Testament into my daily life.'

The Bible Societies have done a wonderful work in translating the Bible into ever so many languages; but there is another sort of translation without which their work is fruitless, and that is the translation of the words of Christ into action in everyday life. The Korean Christian was a translator, the Durham miner was a translator. Are you?

The Secret of Courage.

By the Reverend R. Gledhill, Edgbaston, Birmingham.

'Be strong and of a good courage.'—Jos 1^{9}.

You all enjoy reading in your story-books about brave men and women. You admire the courage

of the heroes and heroines. But in these days of warfare you do not need to read books to meet brave people. You can meet them every day. Our king has chosen a new decoration to mark the courage of his people. To those who are strong and of a good courage, and perform brave deeds, he awards the George Cross. Now for the first time this George Cross has been given, not to a person, but to an island—the island of Malta. It has been given to mark the courage of all who live on this island. Malta has had to suffer more bombing than any other place in the world. But the gallant people who live there are unafraid. What is the secret of their courage?

Can we find the answer in these two stories about Malta? The first incident happened a few months ago. One of our destroyers had arrived there after a long and difficult journey. Our ship had been chased by submarines, and attacked by aeroplanes. But now at last the journey was over. As soon as the destroyer had anchored in Malta harbour the crew asked their captain if a chaplain could be sent to take a service for them. As it was then only Wednesday, the reply came back that the chaplain would be available for a service on Sunday. The crew of that destroyer wanted to put first things first. So they sent another request that they might have a service of thanksgiving immediately. Before anything else, they wanted to join in praise and thanksgiving.

The second story goes back nearly two thousand years. It is about another ship that sailed to Malta (or Melita as it was called in St. Paul's day). This ship also was in difficulties. Storms and heavy seas had battered it, until at last it was wrecked. You can read this exciting sea story in the last two chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. The hero of the story is Paul. Amid all the fury of the storm, and the anxieties of the sailors, he remains unafraid. We read how Paul on board the damaged ship held a service . . . 'he thanked God' . . . and how after this they 'all took courage.'

Two thousand years ago, as to-day, we find courage in and through our worship. It is God who gives courage to those who worship Him. This is the secret of the courage of the people of Malta to-day. They have an inspiring example in their Governor. He knows that they that wait upon the Lord renew their strength. The victory that overcomes the world is our faith. As we are loyal in our prayers and worship we too shall know the secret of courage. In times of stress and strain we too must learn to put first things first; then we shall, even in the dark hour, 'be strong and of a good courage.'

The Christian Year.

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Paradox of Christianity.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., ABERDEEN.

'For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.'—Ro $2^{14.15}$.

'But we preach Christ crucified . . . foolishness.'—1 Co 1^{23}.

In these two verses Paul stated the great paradox of Christianity. 'It answers,' as one has said, 'like no other religion, to that law which, as Paul says, is written in the hearts of all men. With our deepest instincts we know that its demands are right, and that love, truth, goodness, fidelity, have an absolute claim upon us. Yet by all earthly standards the gospel, as Paul again acknowledges, is foolishness. It runs counter to all maxims of prudence, to all those courses of action which the world stamps with its approval by its reward of wealth, success, reputation, happiness.' On the Damascus road Paul was convinced that Jesus' way of life and not the way he was then pursuing was the right way, but, when he endeavoured to follow it, the world which had crucified his Master did not hesitate to persecute him. On the Damascus road he was faced with an ideal to which his whole being responded, but as he endeavoured to attain it he became aware that it was impossible of fulfilment within the world in which his lot was cast, so that, when he had been quite a time on the Christian way, he had to confess that he spoke not as one who had attained nor as one who was already perfect.

Sooner or later, and often sooner rather than later, all of us come face to face with this paradox of Christianity. We have no doubt that Jesus spoke truth and that His counsels are deserving of obedience. Yet who among us finds His ideal possible of attainment in this present world?

Christianity, considered apart from the world, seems most reasonable, but, brought into relation with the world, it seems sheer folly. In an atmosphere such as this we feel the attraction of Jesus' ideal, but we know that before to-morrow is very old we shall have suffered many humiliating defeats in our endeavour to attain it. It is this paradox of Christianity that troubles us. We are convinced of Christianity's truth, yet let us practise it and the shadow of a cross soon lies athwart our path. We feel drawn to the ideal it sets us, yet we become increasingly conscious that it is high and that, situated as we are, we cannot attain unto it.

As men and women who live life thoughtfully, who feel an obligation to God and to men, we can have no peace of mind, no real satisfaction in living, until we have made some attempt to resolve this problem. And it is of the various ways in which we can resolve it that I desire now to speak.

1. Face to face with this truth which strikes a responsive chord in our hearts but which, immediately it is practised in the world, is almost invariably met by persecution or worse, we can decide to cut ourselves off from the world and to betake ourselves to some community in which the pursuit of the ideal will be unattended by opposition and its attainment become more possible.

In every generation there have been some who have chosen such a solution of the problem. Cutting themselves off from all worldly contacts, they have built a little world within the world, a convent or a monastery, in which they have given themselves to the contemplation and the pursuit of the truth revealed in Jesus. It would be unjust to cast any reflection upon the sincerity of such men and women as it would be unfair to suggest that the world, for whose salvation they have prayed, is in no wise richer for their service. Yet, apart from the fact that the majority of us are not free to turn our backs upon the world even if we had the desire, the solution of the problem which such men and women have chosen is not one which meets with general approval. Frankly, we feel that such men and women, instead of facing the problem, have really sought to escape from it, and, so doing, have failed to discharge duties in respect of the world which, we are persuaded, are laid upon every man and woman.

2. There is a second line of action open to us. While convinced of the truth of Christianity, we may, because the world in which we live is so inhospitable to it, decide to abandon all attempts to give effect to it and simply adjust ourselves to those standards which are generally accepted. While we are attracted by the ideal set men by Jesus, we may, because it is impossible of attainment, treat it as a counsel of perfection to which we cannot hope even to approximate and all thought of which we had better therefore abandon.

I need hardly remind you that some in every generation choose this method of solving the problem. In a differently constituted world, they maintain, they would be as enthusiastic for Christianity as their neighbours, but, in a world in which the race is so often to the swift and the battle to the strong, and in which a man's success or failure is so often judged by material standards, it seems folly to close one's eyes to what is practicable and prudent. Better far, they maintain, to be honest, and to own that Christianity, while beautiful and attractive, is outwith the realm of practical politics, than to go on attempting, or pretending to attempt, the impossible and causing oneself much pain and disappointment in the process.

If the first line of action is no real solution of the problem, neither is this second line of action. If the men and women who live a sheltered life ignore the world and their obligation to it, the men and women who decide to live only for material things are ignoring a side of their life which cannot be ignored with impunity. Man has a consciousness of right and wrong, is a creature of dreams and aspirations and ideals, which justifies us in declaring that any one who lives as though right and wrong do not exist and totally indifferent to the light that he sees, is living, however comfortable and prosperous he be, less than a man's life. Besides, we are so made that, when we are untrue to the light we have, we are haunted by regret and remorse, both of which are more difficult to bear than the persecution which often follows an attempt to give effect to principle, and the disappointment we endure when we fail to attain our ideal. This second line of action is, therefore, no real solution of our problem. If life in some little community means deserting the world, life in which no recognition is taken of what we know to be true means deserting our manhood and womanhood.

3. There is a further line of action open to us. We may, while recognizing that it is impossible, as the world is at present constituted, to have Christianity accepted and practised in its fullness, determine to witness to its principles as we are able and are given opportunity. We may, while recognizing that Jesus' ideal for men is unattainable in our present circumstances, unite with Paul who, while he had to admit that he spoke not as one who had attained nor as one who was already perfect, declared, 'this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.'

Professor E. F. Scott, in a recent book, *The Nature of the Early Church*, describes how the original members of Christ's community looked for the immediate coming of the Kingdom in which the principles of Jesus would be loyally obeyed. But the Kingdom for which they looked tarried, and slowly the fact began to dawn upon the followers of Jesus that they were left with an ideal for society to which society was not disposed to be hospitable, and an ideal for themselves which was quite impossible of attainment. Faced with the same paradox of Christianity with which we are faced, what did they do? Abandon the world and live in seclusion, or abandon the ideal and live as the world lived? No, they did neither of these things. They recollected that they had been chosen by Jesus for a specific purpose. They were to represent another order of things than that which presently obtained and were to remind men, by their own example, that men made in the image of God had obligations they must endeavour to fulfil. It was far from an easy task. Again and again they failed to carry the world so far as they desired. Again and again they had to confess that they fell short of the ideal which Jesus had set them. Again and again, like men born out of due time, they had to make compromises which some, who have never attempted to realize an ideal in a hostile world, have criticised. But so nobly did they address themselves to their task, the world of their time was, as the world of to-day is, their debtor.

I wonder if those early followers do not suggest the line we must take in our day and generation? It is true that the world still regards our gospel as 'foolishness,' but surely it would be sheer dereliction of duty to abandon our witness to a gospel we know is true and in obedience to which alone men can find peace! It is true that the following of Jesus' principles sometimes involves persecution, but will it not be a sorry day for the world when men and women cease to sacrifice for ideals and are no longer willing to forgo things material that they may gain something of infinitely greater

value? You and I, and we dare not forget it, are called, just as the original followers were called, for a specific purpose—to witness to another order of things than that which presently obtains and, by precept and example, to awaken in our fellows a discontent with things as they are. It may be that, individually and collectively, we have to compromise in ways which bring us into disrepute among men and cause us much heartsearching and disquiet. But so long as we neither abandon the world because it is so difficult to change, nor abandon the ideal because it is so difficult of attainment, but endeavour under unfavourable conditions to follow the gleam so far as we conscientiously can, I am not sure, in spite of criticisms passed upon the Church and upon individual Christians by men and women who have never tried to realize an ideal in a hostile environment, that we shall prove unacceptable to God. 'One thinks,' says one writer, 'of the old explorers who set out confidently in the quest for El Dorado. They never doubted that it lay somewhere in front of them, just over the horizon, and on their march they built rude settlements which might serve as resting places. The Golden City always remained distant, and as the hope of it faded those settlements took on a new importance. They grew in the course of time into the great cities which we know to-day. It was much in the same manner,' continues this writer, 'that the historical Church arose and expanded. Like the early explorers, the early disciples set out with a magnificent hope. They formed the little community meeting in an upper room which would presently be reunited with Christ in His Kingdom. The Lord did not return, but the community endured and built itself up into the world-wide Church.' You and I are part of that Church, individually and collectively we are called to witness to the quest in which every man was born to participate and to remind men of a Kingdom for whose coming they must needs prepare. We may ourselves fail to attain the ideal, as we may fail to persuade the world to endeavour to attain it, but, provided we neither abandon the task nor rest content with what we have achieved, we may not be unacceptable to God. For the question at the last may be, not 'Hast thou failed?' but 'Hast thou striven?'

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

An Ideal Friendship.

'The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul.'—1 S 18[1].

These two names, David and Jonathan, have been a proverb in every age for true and brave friendship. Damon and Pythias, in the world of classic story, are not worthy to be put beside them, while the love of a Hallam and a Tennyson, enshrined in the poem of *In Memoriam*, belongs at least as much to the sphere of elegiac literature as to that of real life. In this passage we see the two heroes meeting for the first time. David has returned from the slaying of Goliath, and in answer to Saul's question is recounting his name and antecedents. Jonathan stood by, the heir-apparent, and as he looked and listened, something in the young champion's face laid a spell upon his heart. Words of greeting passed; they gazed into each other's eyes, and knew from that hour that each had found his comrade.

Jonathan was a friend worth having. A few chapters back, in one of the best Old Testament tales of adventure, we read of his almost reckless daring in falling upon the Philistines single-handed. No lack of courage there; and courage wonderfully binds man to man.

But, in addition to Jonathan's bravery, he was a man of faith. He is of that great company of chivalrous soldiers, of whom our own country has known a multitude, in whom fearless valour has been accompanied and sanctified by reverence. His faith comes out at many points. As they clamber up the rock he heartens his companion by reminding him that the Lord can save by many or by few. Or, to take another instance, in David's time of outlawry, when he was hunted as a partridge on the mountains, the last meeting between the friends is recorded thus: 'Jonathan, Saul's son, arose, and went to David into the wood, and strengthened his hand in God.' Probably they prayed together, or spoke of God's promises and their own need; anyhow, Jonathan could not have strengthened David's hand in God unless that fount of strength and courage had been rising in his own heart.

Good friends—well, there is no possession which, if we believe in God at all, we are more ready to attribute to His pure loving-kindness and to recognize as a priceless factor in our equipment for life. What moral antiseptic for one moment will compare with a friend who strengthens our hand in God? 'At Eton,' said Bishop Hamilton, 'I was a thoroughly idle boy; but I was saved from worse things by getting to know Gladstone.'

Is Jonathan not the nobler man of these two? His friendship for David, and what he says bears upon ourselves.

One feature is its *disinterested quality*. That first ardour, when they met, might have been only a passing burst of feeling; but, as we read on, it deepens and grows, while all the time it becomes plainer that, from the worldly point of view, Jonathan's conduct was as impolitic as well could be. Everybody else saw that David was his rival for the throne. And Jonathan, ere long, saw it too; but to him it made no difference at all.

Then came David's time of darkness. The jealousy of the half-insane king made him an exile. Will Jonathan not say, reluctantly, of course: 'In other conditions you might have reckoned on me, but I cannot fight with fate.' With most it might be so; with Jonathan it was far otherwise. 'Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women'—so sang David afterwards, recalling his dead friend; and in nothing did the other's fidelity more resemble the love of women than in this, that he clung to David at his lowest, and perhaps his worst.

With all its unlikeness, there is just one other scene in the Bible that gives us the same impression of unselfish abnegation—that hour on the banks of Jordan when John the Baptist pointed to Jesus and cried: 'He must increase; but I must decrease.' Ah! it is the triumph of God within the heart! It is the Holy Spirit's masterpiece when He brings men to say words like that.

Through the disinterested love of Jonathan we can see shining *the glow of hero-worship*, and surely in the heart of man, young or old, there is no more wholesome or pleasing or fruitful temper. Hero-worship is not the same, precisely, as faith, the faith that saves; but they are very close akin—and when you find one growing richly in a human life, the other cannot be far off. When Christ gives a man back his capacity of faith, He restores also his faculty of admiration for good causes and good men.

Again, in this friendship there was *service*. History has been kind to this great attachment; much of its progress has been recorded. Love takes shape in action; if it is real, it breaks through the veil of words and takes concreter forms. And the chief service needed by David just then was protection from Saul. At last, when the king's fury had burst out yet again, the hotter for suppression, and the son appeared before the father, demanding his friend's safety in still firmer tones, that scene of terrible violence ensued in which the mad king attempted his son's life, and, losing for once his brave self-mastery, Jonathan left the presence in silent anger. He left it too with the sad knowledge that events were now beyond his control, and that he must bid farewell to his friend. Thus he served the other at peril of his life.

The service failed, yet it was not in vain. We serve men best not by the objects or things we heap upon them, but by the gift of ourselves. It is easy giving money compared with *that*.

Be loyal and it will actually shed a new and warmer light on our relationship to the Lord Jesus Christ. If, as He tells us, it is only as we forgive that we taste the joy of forgiveness, then, by parity of reasoning, it is only as we prove constant to those who need us, and who have made sacrifices on their part, that we know the faithfulness of that Divine Friend and Brother.

And once more, in this friendship there was *renunciation*.

How the conflict ended we all know. There are things which even for friendship are impossible. Jonathan would not leave his father; would not, even by a sign of withdrawal, precipitate the end. He was a comrade to his comrade; but more and greater, he was a son, and his place was by his father's side. *There* nothing was to be found but misery, coldness, misunderstanding, darkness; but once for all he turned his back on the haunting voices of affection, bent on sharing the ruin he could not now avert.

Temptation may come to us dressed as a very angel of light; it came so to Jonathan. Never is it so subtle as then, never so full of danger. This human story is one evidence more, is it not? that conscience is higher far than feeling, that love must yield to duty, that even the cries of the heart must be stilled in presence of God's command. Jonathan died a heroic death not simply, not mainly, because he fought and fell at a ruined man's side, but because it was a consecrated soul he then laid down. 'Better is he that ruleth his spirit, than he that taketh a city.'

How great are the sacrifices asked of men—to try their heart, to prove their obedience. David and Jonathan were not the first, and they are not the last to feel the touch of that ancient law of God that rends loving hearts asunder, and makes havoc of our plans. God give us grace to receive that holy will, if it should claim us, with the calmness and dedication of Jonathan.[1]

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Pure in Heart.

'Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.'—Mt 5^{8}.

This is perhaps the most searching of the Beatitudes. Its beauty and challenge reach right down into our hearts. Joseph Parker has described the Beatitudes as a marvellous combination of things human and divine. They are eight gates into the Kingdom of Heaven, and their openings are on earth. Purity is one of these gates.

Here again the great Physician of the soul probes deeply. He goes right down into the secret places of our being, and His words have a long history behind them. Originally, purity was given a ceremonial significance. It was related to purification rites and ceremonies that had for their object the removal of anything that was obnoxious to God. On a higher level of Hebrew development it signified moral cleanliness. 'What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God.' Only those whose hearts and hands are pure can ascend the hill of God. In the teaching of Jesus the thought reached its highest level. The pure in heart are blessed *for they shall see God*. We may well hesitate before we dare to write or preach on this saying. Yet for the good of our souls it must be done.

Man's greatest need, in any age, is to experience the vision of God. When Moses, according to the Book of Deuteronomy, was about to say farewell to the people he had led through the wilderness to the borders of the promised land, he delivered a series of eloquent speeches. It was eloquence inspired by a great theme. 'Beware lest thou forget the Lord, thy God.' He knew these people. He knew their weakness and their strength. And he knew that their one great hope of fulfilling the high destiny that lay before them was constantly to remind themselves of God and to keep in touch with Him and His divine law.

This is a note that needs to be sounded in our own times. The world's vast trouble springs in the main from a lost sense of God. The world

[1] H. R. Mackintosh, *Sermons*, 35.

itself, and the whole process of civilization, becomes a meaningless thing if faith in God has gone and all sense of His Presence and Power have been lost. Men are in peril of their morals if they have no deep, abiding sense of God, for morality without religion is a flower cut off from its roots. More, they lose their chance of reaching their highest and their best, for the supreme issue of the Christian faith is its power to create in men and women the highest type of character. The prime necessity of our time is to recover the vision of God.

Sometimes one wonders if men want this vision. Some of His hearers must have been astonished and bewildered when they heard Jesus utter these words. Many of them did not want to see God. The old tradition lingered on, for traditions die hard. 'No man can see God and live.' Mystics have endured purgation and the 'dark night of the soul,' to attain the vision. Some of them were so enraptured by it that they fain would have cut themselves off from their homes, their friends, and the beauties of the earth as from that which could never satisfy again. Maybe God holds us to these things by withdrawing Himself, in a sense, from us. He would not blind us with excess of heavenly light. And perhaps that same thought, hidden in the depths of their being, operates powerfully in men's reticence concerning the need and desire for the vision of God.

Yet many long for it. Thinkers in every age have made this the ultimate goal of their quest. Our restlessness can only end in fellowship with Him. As Bridges has put it, 'Communion with Him is the life of the soul.' *How may we attain the beatific vision?*

We can find God in the ordinary experiences of daily life, in its dear, familiar, homely things. This is a great lesson taught by the prophet Isaiah in the Old Testament; and we know that the mind of Jesus was steeped in Old Testament literature. In the night of Israel's exile, when the exiles felt themselves to be separated from all they had held dear, they were moved to complain, 'Our way is hid from the Lord, our judgment is passed over from our God.' To which Isaiah replied in effect that this was far from being the case. He, too, was in exile; he, too, shared that desolating experience. He, too, hungered for the land given to his fathers. Yet in his prophetic words to these exiles he declares his ringing, confident faith. 'They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles: they shall run and not be weary: they shall walk and not faint.' 'Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel, my way is hid from the Lord, and my judgment is passed over from my God.' The whole situation was full of God for him.

That, too, was the constant note in the teaching of Jesus. Jesus never lost sight of God. Even in the dark moment of dereliction on the Cross He was keenly aware of God. It is to the God *in* the darkness that His desolating cry was uttered and at the end all was beauty and peace. As Dr. James Reid has put it, 'Life was a parable in which He read God's message. The needs of the world were a challenge in which He heard God's voice. Nature was a mirror in which He saw the reflection of the Father's love.' This is true. He came to open our eyes and hearts and minds to this great vision of God, and to help us to understand it. That is what He meant when He said, 'For their sakes I sanctify myself.' At His baptism at the hands of John, He took the sinners' place that they might know that God is in their midst. He shared human hunger in the wilderness refusing to turn stones into bread, knowing that man could not relieve his needs in that way. God is centred there, right in the midst of our humanity with all its limitations. In Gethsemane, and on Calvary, God is revealed in life's deeper experiences, its agonies, its tears, its sufferings. The great message of the Incarnation is that the world is full of God. All life's experiences are full of God. Anywhere, at any hour, in the ordinary things of daily life, men may catch the vision of God.

And many have had this experience. It has been authenticated again and again in the life and experience of ordinary people in every age since 'the days of his flesh.' We were created for this. In great music, in art, in architecture, in heart-moving acts of courage, in amazing self-sacrifice, in great literature, and in the loveliness of Nature or the face of a child, men and women, in every age, have felt eternity spilling over into time. They have recognized the experience for what it really was. They have gazed upon the glory of God. Above all, it has been the witness of Christian people in every generation that we see God best in Jesus Christ. There we see 'the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus.' How is it that so many have never seen the heavenly vision? Why are we so insensitive?

Jesus, Himself, has supplied the answer. 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for *they* shall see God.' That is the inexorable condition which must be fulfilled. 'Purity of heart!' It is a high demand. Few would dare to claim that they have fulfilled it. But He never promises what He cannot fulfil. Evil desires, polluted imagination, distorted motives, and sin-stained souls can be purged and purified. When in knowledge of our utter need in penitence we cry, 'Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me,' the forgiving love of God cleanses away the stains and makes the vision possible.

So does the disciplined life! Once the relationship between the sinner and God has been restored and the sin forgiven and the heart cleansed, there follows the necessity of sustaining the new friendship. We must '*Practise the Presence of God.*' We are far too vague in this matter of prayer, of contact with God.

And, in the last place, let us *fill our minds with the thought of Christ.* There are many things that can purify and stimulate our souls. A great passion for things good and beautiful will do it. A noble purpose will do it. A great love will do it. But none of these is comparable to a great cleansing, saving passion for Jesus Christ and for the things of His Kingdom. His indwelling

Presence is a purifying fire: it is a cleansing passion. Those who dwell in communion with Him know the blessedness that comes to the pure in heart. They see God! [1]

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Life's Authenticated Master.

BY THE REVEREND R. WRAGGE MORLEY, M.A.,
ST. PETER'S VICARAGE, HEREFORD.

'By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?'—Mt 21^{23}.

In a way it was a natural question for the leaders of the nation to ask. On the day before Jesus had done a deed in the cause of righteousness which had sent them scurrying to the council room to discuss what they would do. For He had driven their money-changers out of the Temple; and the money-changers were the source of much gain. Moreover, it was not the first upsetting thing He had done, by any means, apart from His teaching, and the defection of the people to the new Leader. It was a situation that was awkward, dangerous, and intolerable. So it was that they came the next day with this clever question: 'By what authority doest thou these things; and who gave thee this authority?' They did not really want to know; they wanted rather to overthrow. That is why He gives them their question back. 'Come!' He says, 'I will show you an authoritative man—John, the Baptizer, whence came his authority?' It should have made them think; actually it merely made them angry. So much for the setting. But the question is a real one on other lips. We ought to face it.

Life does need some satisfactory and final authority. If we think at all we must see the need of one to-day. Here we are, the whole lot of us, caught in a dissolving epoch of history with no clear idea where we are coming out. And not merely because of the war. Listen to these words written by an able editor of a review three years before war burst upon us: 'Our fathers lived in a world; but our generation has been living in a stream. . . . Change is the only permanent certainty—this paradox has been the final formula for our world-view. . . . The sense of stability and anchorage has been loosened where it has not been destroyed.' It is imperative that we shall discover some guidance that is beyond question. Otherwise we shall be like the youth, who, with youth's audacity had written a book on Woman, of which he was very proud. When he came to revise it for a new edition he was forced to place on the front page a note: 'Wherever in this book you see the verb "is" put "is not"; and wherever you see "is not" put "may be," "perhaps," or "God knows".' When the subject is life itself there is no comedy in that; we are near to the supreme tragedy. No civilization can continue to endure that has suffered its vital beliefs to be torn from it. We need an authority that shall bind the soul.

[1] J. Short, *All Things are Yours*, 77.

Now on what base will you erect that authority? Not on a Church—it is too fallible and lethargic; not on a Book—that is too static, and we can twist its words to suit our purposes, especially if there is in it the progressive revelation of long periods of time, as there is in our Bible; not on reason alone—for that is often too gullible and prejudiced. We need a person—one who does not get outgrown; one who is in harmony with ultimate reality. For the making of men what is needed is one who will compel us to go questing on; who will challenge us not to keep life static, but to keep it true. That means that the unmistakeable certainty we crave is not to be ours. But, what matter! to be dead certain does not minister to growth, but to death. 'Man cannot accept certainties; he must discover them,' as Middleton Murry says. We need a person, and there is only one mankind will look at to-day with any hope. When Olive Schreiner was very young she read for the first time the Sermon on the Mount. 'She ran to her mother, putting her finger on the passage in great excitement, and saying: "Look what I've found! It's what I've known all along. Now we can live like this." But when she found, as she very soon did, that people did not "live like this," and had no intention of doing so, she chilled rapidly.' There is our tragedy! Can Jesus rightly claim our allegiance? If so, by what authority does He do it? May I suggest that He gives us the best basis for our living, He shows the greatest mastery of the art of living, and men trusting Him find reinforcement.

1. *The Authenticity of His Message.*

The manner of it was something new and different. He does not argue, He asserts and reveals. And His word authenticates itself; our minds answer it. With others of His time teaching was a profession, with Him it was a matter of life and death. He was so sure of its truth and reality, so eager for the good of the sons of men. His word was of big elemental things, simply and searchingly put, caught as it were out of the midst of life itself—God, faith, the supremacy of the spiritual, the relationships of life, the chance of renewal, the assurance of eternal life. These things assuredly held make life a different thing. He spoke with authority because He had mastered truth and truth had mastered Him. So one of the greatest modern Jewish teachers, Mr. Montefiore, says of Him: 'His teaching is fresher than that of the Rabbis. It is more inspired. It is grander. It is more prophetic.' And remember, as Hugo told us: 'There is only one thing mightier than armies, and that is an idea whose hour has come.' I believe the hour has come for His idea, His word, and that as we follow it the alien armies will melt away.

It is not only the manner of His teaching that validates it, but its content. He built it all on God. He was so very sure of Him. And He so lived by it, proved it, exemplified it, that all our thought of God comes now from Him. And, seeing Jesus we are sure it is true; as Stanley became sure of Christ through seeing Livingstone.

'I knew there was a Christ because there was a Livingstone.' And He gave us new hope in man. He expected so much from the most unlikely, and He brought it out time and again. He so lived Himself that we know Emerson was right: 'We are dwarfs of ourselves.' He gave us too our loftiest ethical ideal; with that deep emphasis on thought and motive, and that wide responsibility towards others without limitation of class or type or nation. He opened up new reserves of spiritual power to us; and men tried out His promises and found them true. There has never in history been so sublime an exhibition of confidence in spiritual forces. And in it all He speaks to the deepest needs of men with all His life behind His words; so that when He says: 'Come unto Me and I will give you rest,' we know He has the right to do so, and in our inmost souls too know that it is true. This, then, is the second thing.

2. The Mastery of His Manhood.

That is why His words come down to us so freshly from the long ago—they dealt with essential things and His life was behind them. And about that life there is a quality that is unique. He lived as no other person ever lived. Yet as we see Him we know this is what we ought to be. He was the first man of us to show what living really means, what human life is meant to be, and can be, and at heart really wants to be. In the realm of goodness He is supreme. Poise, adequacy, strength, penetration, sympathy—they are all there, and always there. 'Behold the Man!' So it is that this strange history of His life, which seems to move from obscurity into such success that the end is tragedy, yet reads to us like triumph all the way. We never feel that He is beaten. He is, as Drinkwater said of Lincoln, always 'Lord of His event.' We cannot, dare not, would not dethrone Him. His life is woven inextricably into the texture of the world's history. It is a perpetual incentive, challenge, encouragement. When we see Him we know 'This Man is of God.' It is our wisdom to listen to Him and to follow Him. And there is yet a third thing.

3. The Persistence of His Regenerating Power.

There have been many who have claimed to have power. 'I can call spirits from the vasty deep,' boasts Owen Glendower; but his comrade calls his bluff. 'Yes, but will they come when you do call them?' In Jesus the power was there. Men and women were changed. This Cross to which He went, with the experience of His risen presence afterwards was the credential of His message of God's redeeming love, the exhibition alike of His confidence in God and man, and of His utter love for all of us. It was His beacon of hope. Man can start afresh. Mankind shall rise again. Jesus believed in us and our future up to the Cross. As one has said, it is a long way for belief to go. And still He remakes men and women; still He masters human hearts. 'From a great heart secret magnetism flows incessantly to draw great events,' says the essayist. It is true; but there is more here than that. There is a sense of the finality of His message, a sense too of His presence with us, real and different from any other, that grips our lives to-day. We know it is Christ or chaos. After a very stormy heckling of Stanley Jones, a Hindu College Professor, walking away with him remarked, 'Whatever they may say, it is a fact nevertheless that most of the world's best thought is revolving about Jesus Christ.' Wherever there are honest men His influence is not waning. For this is the One we need. The more we see Him the larger He appears, and the brighter our hope grows. This is the authentic Master of life; the One who gives us hope for the uncertain days ahead; the Leader we need for the struggle for a better order. Without Him what hope have we? But with Him as Master the future days will yet be bright.

Bible, Church, Experience.

By the Reverend A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., D.Th., London.

(1) In the two Œcumenical Conferences on Faith and Order—Lausanne 1927, and Edinburgh 1937—the aim has been, not to negotiate reunion, but to promote mutual understanding and closer fellowship in Christ by fully and frankly discussing differences as well as agreements. It must be confessed that the agreements have so far not been successfully applied to the resolution of the differences; and most of the Churches 'stand put' where they were in their convictions, although the sense of spiritual unity in Christ has deepened as also has the aspiration for organic reunion, even although it seems at present still impracticable. From the discussions some general conclusions have emerged.

(2) Many of the differences can be traced to varying emphases on the Bible, the Church and Experience, and the agreements in the recognition that all these factors in Christian Faith and Order are mutually dependent and cannot be separated, however the emphasis varies. Although it cannot be said that any of the Christian communions lay all the stress on one of the factors, yet it may be said that the 'Catholic' type assigns more significance to the Church, and the Protestant to the

Bible, and accordingly each values more highly either the sacraments or the preaching of the gospel. While mysticism has always made its appeal to experience, and the Society of Friends, among contemporary tendencies, follows the mystical tradition, yet in the more recent developments in Protestantism, where the literary and historical criticism of the Holy Scriptures has had influence, the authority of Christ has replaced the authority of the Bible: and it is Christ as *experienced* in the sufficiency of His grace as Saviour and of His truth as the Revealer of the Father. In the Conclusion of the valuable Report of the Church of England on the Edinburgh Conference, three tendencies are mentioned, the Lutheran standpoint 'that the Church is the Creation of the Word of God,' that 'a second basis for Christian Unity is found in Christian Experience,' and that 'the Church as an Institution' is needed 'as an external framework' (pp.33–34)—the three factors already mentioned.

(3) In qualification of, if not in opposition to, the criticism of the Bible already mentioned, there is advanced in some Continental Theology the claim for the Bible that it contains, or even is identical with the Word of God, the revelation of God in Christ as the Incarnate Word. This *objective standard* rests, however, on a *subjective basis*, human experience of divine reality. This revelation of God in prophets and apostles as in Christ Himself was received and could not but be received in *experience*: but all the agents of the revelation continued a *religious tradition*, the prophets the Mosaic Torah, Christ law and prophecy, the apostles the life and teaching of Christ, and belonged to a *religious community*, the Jewish nation or the Christian Church. No Christian Experience is independent of the Bible and the Church; when it has ventured to be so, it has strayed into strange and dangerous ways, and that seems to me to be the danger of the doctrine of the inner light in all men.

(4) Catholicism of all types claims that the revelation recorded in the *Bible* is continued in *Tradition* transmitted in the *Church*. A difference in the Orthodox and the Roman Catholic conception may, however, be noted. For the Orthodox tradition is *static*, fixed in the eighth century on the seven councils of the undivided Church: for the Romans, it is *dynamic* in the infallible *ex cathedra* deliverances of the Pope. Protestantism has rejected *Tradition*, but surely in its creeds or catechisms, the Westminster, the Augsburg or the Heidelberg, in so far as it adheres to them, it accepts the principle. If God has given to the Church the Spirit of truth to guide into all the truth, in new interpretations and fresh applications of the revelation in Christ, then it is justified in recognizing in the scholars, sages, seers, and saints, whom He gives to it, the chosen agents of a continuous revelation, not superseding that recorded in the Bible, but subordinate to it and supplementing it as interpretation and application to adapt the mission and the message of the Church to the changing needs of men.

(5) In basing the claim of the Bible to be accepted as authoritative on the *testimonium internum Spiritus Sancti* the Reformation conceded the continuity of the experience of the revelation of God in *Christian experience*. While the Catholic type needs to recognize such experience as conveying because receiving the continued presence and activity of Christ by His Spirit, and as modifying, where is need, the *static* tradition of Orthodoxy or the *dynamic* of the Papacy, the individualist tendency in Protestantism must beware of exalting the authority of *experience* isolated and independent of Bible and Church, as ultimate and final. There is an *objective Christianity*, common to all the Churches despite their differences, that can and needs to restrain *subjective* vagaries. As *laissez-faire* has failed in economics, and 'national sovereignty' in politics, so has this individualism in religion. As the Anglican Report fully recognizes, each of these emphases in separation is wrong, only as the three factors so emphasized are synthesized, can the proper proportion and balance in Faith and Order be secured.

(6) We may understand the matter better if we trace the three sources of authority to the three factors in the development of human personality—inheritance, environment, and individuality. We are persons not made, but in the making: the past makes its contribution in the inheritance (physical and social), the present in the environment, and the future depends on what each man in his individuality, that which he *is in himself* as different from every other self, and by his freedom *makes of himself* out of the raw material which his inheritance and his environment supply. The Bible and the Tradition form the inheritance, and the Church the environment, while in the experience the individuality finds its expression. No man can be 'the utmost for the best' that he is capable of becoming, if he neglects his inheritance, or is uninfluenced by his environment, and asserts his individuality in disregard or opposition to both. So also a man fails to become all God means him to be, if he is enslaved by his inheritance or his environment, and never allows himself to become fully and freely himself as God wills.

(7) The problem of Faith and Order, as discussed in the two Conferences, is thus one instance of the universal human problem, how continuity with the past may be preserved, community in the present be maintained and progress for the future be

achieved. May we not dare to believe and hope, that as Christian men by the grace of Christ achieve the fullness in wholeness of personality such as was Christ's, so will the Church of Christ, who is the *macrocosm*, of which each Christian is a *microcosm*, show the fullness of the Godhead *bodily* (in wholeness Col 2^9). So the *chaos* will become the *cosmos*, by the brooding and life-giving Spirit, and the new Creation complete the old (Gn 1^2). Our Lord Jesus Christ was a Jew in the Roman Empire, and came in 'the fullness of the time' of God's Providence in human history, and although His life, teaching, and work were affected by His inheritance and His environment, yet He transcended both, for His individuality, as Son of God and Son of Man, can be described as *universality*. Nothing human was alien to Him, in Him the fullness of God and man dwelt *bodily* (in wholeness). In the greatest of His apostles, the Jewish Rabbi (inheritance), the Roman citizen (environment), and the Christian preacher, teacher, writer, and founder of churches (individuality) were combined to give to mankind the profoundest interpretation of the gospel, and the sublimest exposition of the one Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church. If the Churches cannot rise to the stature of Christ, they may at least strive to follow the Apostle in His ideal of the Church as the body of Christ, the community of the Spirit, and the temple of God.

Contributions and Comments.

The Evil Eye.

I CANNOT help feeling that Dr. C. Ryder Smith imparts a little needless complexity into his interesting study on this subject in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for February, by overlooking a simple but very relevant fact. I mean the fact that, throughout the Bible, the phrase seems to have nothing whatever to do with witchcraft of any kind, nor even to refer to evil motive in general, but almost always clearly means simply stinginess, or love for one's own possessions. This becomes unmistakably clear from a perusal of the clearest passages in which the phrase is used. These are

(1) Dt 15^9. The warning against withholding a loan from a poor fellow-Israelite because of the near approach of the seventh year, when all debts were to be cancelled, is thus reinforced: 'Beware that there be not a base thought in thine heart, saying, The seventh year, the year of release, is at hand; and *thine eye be evil* against thy poor brother, and thou give him nought; and he cry unto the Lord against thee, and it be sin in thee.'

(2) Dt $28^{54f.}$. The Israelite demoralized by famine in the siege will refuse to share what food he has with his brother, his wife, and his children: '*his eye will be evil* toward' them. (For $v.^{56}$, see below.)

(3) Pr $23^{6f.}$. 'Eat thou not the bread of *him that hath an evil eye*, neither desire thou his dainties. . . . Eat and drink, saith he to thee; but his heart is not with thee.'

(4) Pr 28^{22}. '*He that hath an evil eye* hasteth after riches, and knoweth not that want will come upon him.'

(5) Sir 14^{10}. 'An evil eye is grudging over bread; and he is miserly (ἐλλιπής, lit. "deficient") at his table' (cf. To $4^{7.\ 16}$).

(6) Mt 20^{15}. The generous employer answers the protest of the labourers who received no more than those who had worked one hour, by asking one of them, '*Is thine eye evil* because I am good?'

These passages put the normal meaning of the phrase beyond any reasonable doubt. Dr. Ryder Smith combines with them the statement that Saul 'eyed David' (1 S 18^9), and infers that 'the Old Testament means by an Evil Eye an evil *motive*.' But, while the phrase seems to be used in Dt 28^{56} of malevolence in general, it does not occur at all in the story of Saul: we are therefore hardly justified in utilizing the account of Saul's ill-will in order to elucidate its meaning.

If 'an evil eye' means stinginess, 'a good eye' ought to mean generosity. And so we find it does. Dr. Ryder Smith is in error in saying that this latter phrase is not used. See Pr 22^9 ('He that has a good eye shall be blessed, for he gives of his bread to the poor'), Sir 35^8 ('With a good eye glorify the Lord, and stint not the firstfruits of thine hands'), and $v.^{10}$ ('Give to the Most High according to His giving [unto thee], and with a good eye according to the acquisition of [thine] hand'): also 31^{23} in the Syriac.

In the Gospels (Lk 11^{34}=Mt $6^{22f.}$) the evil eye is contrasted with 'the single eye':[1] and it is some confirmation of the interpretation to which the passages already quoted have led us that the adjective ἀγαθός, the noun ἁπλότης, and the adverb ἁπλῶς are all used in the Greek Bible to designate generosity (see Pr 11^{25}, Mt 20^{15}, 2 Co 8^2 $9^{11.\ 13}$, Ro 12^8, Philem ^{14}, Ja $1^{5.\ 17}$)—though of course they bear other senses also.

There is no need to suppose, as Dr. Ryder Smith does, that Jesus used the phrase 'an evil eye' in a different sense from what was already

[1] This usage, which Dr. Ryder Smith thinks was of Jesus' own coining, is found also in *Test. Issachar*, iii. 4.

customary. His application of it in Mt 20^{15} to the evil motive of stinginess was not a new idea of His own, but was (as we have seen) amply anticipated in the Old Testament. When therefore He includes the evil eye in the list of 'evil thoughts' which proceed from the heart of man (Mk $7^{21f.}$; Mt 15^{19} omits it), there is no need to suppose that He means anything else than closefistedness and greed.[1]

When therefore we come to the obscurer saying recorded in Lk 11^{34-36}=Mt $6^{22f.}$, in which Jesus warns His hearers that the light or darkness of the whole body depends on whether the eye be 'single' or 'evil,' there is no need for us to go hunting after fresh and far-fetched meanings which owe nothing to the abundant Biblical evidence adduced above.[2] I have heard a distinguished preacher of the present day devote a whole sermon to this text, and without making a single reference to generosity and its opposite, arbitrarily identify the single eye with the acceptance of the Christian gospel (stated in very conservative terms), and then use the text to prove such acceptance to be indispensable yet adequate for all the needs of life. The late Dr. C. Anderson Scott roved yet more widely, and in a sermon on the catalogue of sins in Mk $7^{21f.}$ (according to a report in *The Christian World* for 7th April 1932) tentatively identified the evil eye with 'the "tarnished eye," spoken of by George Meredith, "which cast discolouration all around"'! Even Dr. Ryder Smith goes much beyond the evidence in saying that Jesus 'revolutionized the whole concept' and meant evil motive as such, and in moralizing speculatively on that basis. It is, indeed, remarkable that, in using the strange figure of light being admitted to, or excluded from, the whole body by the eye, Jesus makes of generosity and its opposite such cardinal qualities. There is room here for a good exegetical discussion; but if it is to lead to any useful results, it must at least start with what we *know* regarding the meaning of the phrases which He used.

I am not, of course, forgetting that there has been, both in ancient and modern times, and among many peoples, a widespread belief in the possession by certain persons of a magic power of harming others by simply looking at them. That some connexion must exist between this popular superstition and the clear Biblical usage may reasonably be assumed. The general concept of malevolence, faintly perceptible in one or two of the passages we have quoted, would form a common link between them. In Rabbinic literature both ideas are found side by side.[3] I do not propose to investigate here the question as to the precise historical relation between them: but I do wish to observe that, so far as I can discover, the Bible in its original text contains no clear trace of the magical idea connected with the phrase 'an evil eye,' but uses this phrase and its opposite simply to designate the contrasted qualities of stinginess and generosity.[4] It seems to me therefore very questionable whether magical parallels can throw any light on the exegesis of the Biblical passages concerned; and I even doubt the legitimacy of so widening the Biblical concept as to make it inclusive of motive in general and of then basing imaginative moral speculations upon it.

C. J. CADOUX.

Oxford.

[1] In Sir 31^{13}, a *general* reference to an 'evil eye' is immediately followed by the apparent assumption that the eye is the organ of evil-doing par excellence. Cf. *Test. Issachar*, iv. 6.

[2] Cheyne (in *Encyc. Bibl.*, 1453) and Strack-Billerbeck (i. 432), however, regard the reference to generosity and stinginess here as too narrow.

[3] Cf. L. Blau in *Jewish Encyc.* v. (1903), 280 f.; Strack-Billerbeck, i. 833–835, ii. 14 f.; Cohen, *Everyman's Talmud*, 287–291. The *Biblical* sense seems to be assumed in *Pirkê Aboth*, 2^{11} and 5^{19} (Danby, 449, 458); cf. also Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, 137 n. 4.

[4] L. Blau (in *loc. cit.*) says the magical idea *was* held in Biblical times, and refers for support to the Biblical evidence for the use of amulets, etc. Without, however, denying that this use reflects the prevalence of a (perhaps largely unconscious) belief in magic, we do well to note that in the Bible the 'evil eye' is never mentioned in connexion with amulets. The use of the word βάσκανος in the LXX of Pr 23^{6}, 28^{22}, and Sir 14^{3} is, so far as I am aware, the earliest evidence of a Jewish recognition of the *magical* meaning of the phrase 'an evil eye.'

A Note on ἀποθνήσκω and κοιμάω in 1 Corinthians xv. 20, 22.

THE presence of ἀποθνήσκω and κοιμάω in close proximity in 1 Co $15^{20.\ 22}$ raises an interesting question. It will be noticed that of those described as 'in Adam' (*v.*[22]) Paul uses the verb ἀποθνήσκω, but of believers κοιμάω is used (*v.*[20]). Does this point to a use of κοιμάω which is indicative of a new regard for death, bestowed by the teaching of Jesus? It seems that Paul could speak of the children of Adam using ἀποθνήσκω—simply 'dead'—but of believers in Christ, for whom death is but a state from which there is an awakening, κοιμάω is used. 'The appropriateness of κοιμάω,' says Milligan, commenting on 1 Th 4^{13}, 'led Paul to prefer it to ἀποθνήσκω in regard to the death of believers.'

We cannot, of course, press the use of the word to prove that in every instance κοιμάω refers to the hope of the Christian resurrection. Its use in the LXX—*e.g.* in Gn 47^{30} and II Reg. 7^{12} where the reference is to the Hebrew custom of burial in the ancestral tomb—rules out any universal reference to the Christian hope; but if, as Robertson and Plummer say, 'the word was welcomed by Christians as harmonizing with the belief in a resurrection' its proximity to ἀποθνήσκω in 1 Co 15 shows that Paul's choice of the word is deliberate when he is speaking of Christian believers.

In 1 Co 15 (apart from ἀποθνήσκω being used of the death of Christ when His resurrection is

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL

treated fully in the following verses) κοιμάω *only* is used of believers; in fact, the departed are spoken of simply as οἱ κοιμώμενοι. κοιμάω is used in Jn 11[11] of Lazarus, by Jesus; in Ac 7[60] of the death of Stephen; in Mt 27[54], 1 Co 15[20], 1 Th 4[13-15], 1 Co 15[18] of 'them that sleep.' On the other hand θνήσκω and its compounds are used in Mt 2[20] of Herod and his crew; Mk 15[44], on the lips of Pilate, of the death of Jesus; in Lk 7[12] of the widow's son; in Jn 11 of Lazarus when spoken of by Martha; in Jn 19[33] when the soldiers saw the death of Jesus.

Thus the balance of usage of these two verbs seems to be:

(*a*) Of Christian believers κοιμάω is used of death.

(*b*) Of unbelievers θνήσκω or ἀποθνήσκω is used.

(*c*) Of the death of Jesus, invariably ἀποθνήσκω; this is accounted for by the fact that His resurrection is presupposed.

Thus the distinction between ἀποθνήσκω and κοιμάω, exemplified by Paul in 1 Co 15[20. 22], seems to be no mere literary device to avoid using the same word twice, but the reflection of a growing feeling in Christian circles that for a believer death is commingled with hope (See J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 162). To express this conviction ἀποθνήσκω is rejected in favour of κοιμάω. The use of these words might contribute to a fuller understanding of the contribution made by Christian teaching to first-century thought of death and the future life.

JOHN C. BOWMER.

Jarrow-on-Tyne.

A Note on πρὸς ἐμαυτόν (John xiv. 3) and εἰς τὰ ἴδια (John i. 11):

A Plea for a Revised Translation.

I HAVE never been able to make a sense which satisfied me out of the rendering, 'I will . . . receive you unto myself,' common to both A.V. and R.V., of παραλήμψομαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμαυτόν in Jn 14[3]. What action on the part of the Risen Lord, when He comes again to the disciples, is denoted by that expression, and how is 'that where I am there ye may be also,' the natural outcome of that action? I venture to suggest a different and, as I think, a more beautiful translation. To begin with, the verb needs to be given its much more natural sense, one which it bears in quite a number of passages. Out of them I need only cite Mt 4[5. 8] 17[1], Mk 5[40], Lk 9[28], Ac 15[39]. In all those (and other) instances παραλαμβάνω means 'to take along with one's self, in one's company,' and that is a meaning which is quite fitting in the passage under discussion, especially when πρὸς ἐμαυτόν is properly understood. In that phrase I am convinced that we have an occasional and special use of the reflexive pronoun, for which there are parallels in N.T. Greek. It is an abbreviated way of denoting one's home. In Jn 20[10], *e.g.*, we have 'The disciples departed to their homes' (πρὸς αὐτούς). Compare a similar form and statement in Lk 24[12]. Again in 1 Co 16[2] St. Paul asks each of the Corinthian Christians to lay up weekly 'in his home' (παρ' ἑαυτῷ) a gift for the poor saints of Jerusalem. In these passages 'home' is the rendering required. It goes without argument that a usage thus permissible for the 3rd person reflexive, was equally permissible for the 1st person when that was required by the sense. Hence these grammatical considerations lead me to translate Jn 14[3], 'I will come again and take you with me to my home.' How naturally there then follows, 'that where I am there ye may be also.'

As regards τὰ ἴδια in Jn 1[11] no one, lacking knowledge of the Greek original and reading that passage in the A.V., where 'his own' is used to translate both τὰ ἴδια and οἱ ἴδιοι, would suspect that the two expressions were of different genders. The R.V. prevents that confusion by translating, 'He came unto his own' (τὰ ἴδια) 'and they that were his own' (οἱ ἴδιοι) 'received him not.' Still in my judgment even that rendering is capable of improvement. Have we not here a special use of τὰ ἴδια, which the translators in both cases have failed to perceive? In the Greek both of the N.T. and of the Septuagint Version of the O.T. the phrase is found occasionally in sentences where both the context and the sense require it to be translated by 'home.' To take N.T. instances first, in Jn 19[27] it is said concerning the mother of Jesus, 'From that hour the disciple took her to his home' (εἰς τὰ ἴδια). A similar translation fits Ac 21[6] and Jn 16[32]. It seems to me to be credible also that Peter's words in Lk 18[28], ἀφέντες τὰ ἴδια, since the comment Jesus is led to make on it enumerates wife, brethren, parents, children, *i.e.* members of a family, as what has been left, mean, 'Lo, we have left our homes and followed thee.' (I observe that the R.V. has that translation in the margin.) The same use of τὰ ἴδια is found in the LXX. In Est 5[10] 6[12] εἰς τὰ ἴδια expresses 'to his home.' Hence I am led to claim as the proper rendering of Jn 1[11], 'He came to his home,' *i.e.* to the nation which had been so specially and providentially prepared for His advent that, in coming to it, Jesus might be said to be coming 'home,' 'and yet' (the adversative καί) 'his own folk' (or better still, 'the folk of his home') 'received him not.'

A. LEWIS HUMPHRIES.

Hale, Cheshire.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.